

BR
84.5
J57
v.1


CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 092 323 694



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.



Chapman Paris.

ANTOINE ARNAULD.

Doctor of the Sorbonne

THE GALRICAN CHURCH.

A

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF FRANCE,

FROM THE CONCORDAT OF BOLOGNA, A.D. 1516, TO
THE REVOLUTION.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION.

BY REV. W. HENLEY JERVIS, M.A.,

PREBENDARY OF HEYTESBURY;

AUTHOR OF 'THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF FRANCE.'

"Fluctuat, nec mergitur."

IN TWO VOLUMES.—VOL. I.

WITH PORTRAITS.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1872.

A.5629

~~4102A6~~

LONDON

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET,
AND CHARING CROSS.



PREFACE.

THE present is an attempt to interest English readers in a field of study which, for whatever reason, has not received among us the amount of attention it deserves. Our literature is not deficient, indeed, in popular productions designed to illustrate different periods and phases of the history of Christianity in France; but they are of a sporadic and fragmentary character. The religious life of that great province of Christendom has not hitherto been treated in our language, so far as I am aware, on any connected plan. Partial glimpses of it have been offered us in memoirs of the Huguenots and the Vaudois; in sketches of the Calvinistic Reformation; in narratives of the persecutions which preceded and followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; in notices of the adventures of Protestant refugees in our own land and elsewhere. These are stirring themes, commanding, in their due measure, our earnest sympathies. They are, however, but episodes; episodes, too, of a somewhat narrow and one-sided type. The position of the Calvinists of France, with regard to the National Church from which they separated, corresponds exactly with that of the Lollards, the Puritans, and the more modern Nonconforming sects, with reference to the National Church of England.

In like manner the English mind has become familiar

with certain memorable movements affecting the internal history of the Church in France, which are associated with individual names of widespread celebrity. Most persons of average culture are acquainted with the main features of the desperate war between Jesuit and Jansenist. The studious of both sexes have lingered over the fascinating, almost romantic, annals of Port-Royal; they have admired the lofty independence of St. Cyran, the heroism of Antoine Arnauld, the steadfast endurance of the Abbess Angélique, the splendid genius and matchless wit of Pascal. Nor have there been wanting, from time to time, those who have recognised the attractions of Bossuet and the “Four Gallican Articles;” of Fénelon and the ‘*Maximes des Saints*;’ of the oratorical triumphs of Bourdaloue and Massillon; of the herculean labours of the Benedictines of St. Maur.

Yet the eclectic mode of dealing with Church history, in sections capriciously detached from their context, is always attended with more or less disadvantage. It is questionable whether the events of any given passage of the Church’s life can be rightly interpreted except in connexion with the lessons and experience both of antecedent and of subsequent times. All Christian ages are intensely cognate. The history of any one of them demands, as its full complement and ultimate elucidation, the history of all. If the law of continuity—the mysterious concatenation of cause and effect—be a recognised principle in the world of nature, much more does it reign supreme over the Spiritual Economy. In mundane concerns its precise operation must often be matter of uncertain speculation. Human institutions vary with the “spirit of the age;” and it is not always easy to account for the fluctuations of that extremely

volatile and fugitive element in the history of nations. Political dynasties rise and fall; one race succeeds another on the proud pinnacle of earthly domination; art and science, philosophy and literature, social refinement, industrial enterprise, military prestige, migrate from clime to clime, sink and decay, revive and flourish,—by steps which in all cases are difficult to analyse, and in some are so obscure as to elude investigation. But the organisation of the Church is Divine and changeless. Its external polity, its doctrine, its laws, its ordinances, as they were received in the days *e. g.* of Augustine or Gregory the Great, are no mere matters of curiosity for the antiquary or of criticism for the scholar, but matters of universal interest, facts of ever-enduring moment, decisions for all time. The threefold cord of continuity—continuity (1) of government, (2) of doctrinal faith, (3) of Sacramental Grace—may be said to constitute the “philosophy” of Christian history. To this normal law of its being, to this vital interpretative principle, all the multiform details of the Church’s action may be referred. This is the secret of its marvellous strength; the sufficient explanation of its mightiest triumphs.

The Church is, indeed, subject to strange vicissitudes and startling anomalies. Its life is a many-sided life, full of varying lights and shadows, seasons of prosperity and adversity, alternations of apparent defeat and visible success, wide contrasts of individual character, ranging between the extreme of weakness and inconsistency and the most exalted saintliness. But, viewed comprehensively, it is the perpetual outgrowth of God’s new creation; the uninterrupted development of the Kingdom of grace. The history of that life is continuous beyond all other examples of continuity. The existing state of

Christendom is, in the most literal sense, the product of the past; while, on the other hand, the past is the most faithful interpreter of the manifold enigmas and perplexities, as well as of all the hopeful phenomena, which characterize the present.

By this rule I have endeavoured to guide myself in surveying the particular branch of the vast stream of history to which these volumes relate. Without pretending to furnish a complete or highly-finished picture of the Gallican Communion through all the centuries of its existence, it has been my object to draw together some of the more important links by which the Primitive and the Mediæval are connected with modern developments of Catholicity; to indicate those great landmarks of ancient Tradition to which successive generations of the Gallican episcopate were wont to recur in moments of perplexity and peril; to elucidate the relationship between the Church of Martin and Hilary, of Avitus and Cæsarius, of Bernard and Ivo, and the “*Ecclesia docens*” of times bordering on our own.

The treasures of French literature, in the department of ecclesiastical history, antiquities, and biography, are so copious, so well digested, and so easily accessible, as to leave the student little or nothing to desire. The chief difficulty is the “*embarras de richesse* ;”—the question of selection. I subjoin a brief account of the principal sources from which my materials have been drawn.

There are two extensive collections of information relating to the history of the Gallican Church, which have the advantage of bearing the stamp of official authority. The first is that entitled ‘*Recueil des Actes, Titres et Mémoires, concernant les affaires du Clergé de*

France.' The second is the 'Collection des Procès-verbaux des Assemblées Générales du Clergé de France.' The former work was undertaken originally in 1645; and was continued, in a series of constantly enlarged editions, down to 1771, when it was republished for the last time. Its present form and plan of distribution were suggested to the Assembly of the Clergy in the year 1700 by a distinguished advocate of the Parliament of Paris, named Le Merre. He was commissioned to execute it, under the superintendence of Cardinal de Noailles, the Archbishop of Narbonne, and the Bishops of Laon and Troyes. The learned Abbé Dorsanne, Canon and Archdeacon of Notre Dame, was afterwards associated with him in the work.

It is arranged under six divisional heads. (I.) The Catholic faith and doctrine of the Church. (II.) The Ministers of the Church. (III.) Divine Service. (IV.) Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. (V.) The benefices and other property of the Church. (VI.) The privileges and immunities of the Church and Clergy. These various sections comprise an immense mass of historical documents and records, illustrating *in extenso* the details of doctrinal belief and ecclesiastical discipline as received and administered in France. The chief authorities cited are the great Œcumenical Councils, the Canon Law, Gallican Provincial Synods, Royal Ordonnances, and the *arrêts* of the Courts of Parliament. It is, however, by no means a mere compilation of dry facts and judicial decisions. It is interspersed throughout with learned notes and observations by the Editors, containing critical and explanatory matter of deep interest. In some instances they have inserted entire treatises by approved divines; among which is that by Hallier, Bishop of Cavaillon, on Jurisdiction, and

Bossuet's 'Exposition de la Foi Catholique.' The XIIth Volume consists of an elaborate synopsis of the tradition of the Church from the earliest times on the subject of ecclesiastical Elections, including a view of the changes introduced in that respect by the Concordat of Bologna.

The 'Collection des Procès-verbaux des Assemblées Générales, Ordinaires, et Extraordinaires du Clergé de France' consists, as its title implies, of the authorized series of reports of the proceedings of the Clergy in their representative Assemblies held periodically by royal licence in or near Paris. It is a production in the highest degree honourable to the Church of France. Though concerned to a great extent with temporal matters, these volumes bear ample testimony to the eminent merits and attainments of the authors in every branch of ecclesiastical knowledge and duty. They extend from the year 1560-61, when the Gallican clergy were first convoked for the despatch of business in the new form which was substituted for their ancient canonical Synods, down to 1786, when the Revolution was almost at the doors. If, amid the severe ordeals to which the Church was subjected during that long period, the Assemblies of the Clergy failed occasionally in consistency and dignity, it must be allowed that the voluminous records of their debates exhibit a reach and variety of learning, an extent of patient research, and an ardent zeal for the interests of religion, which are above all praise.

The masterpieces of the great Gallican School of divines who flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, though not strictly historical in form, are replete with the indispensable materials of history, and are the most trustworthy guides that we possess in

their different spheres of ecclesiastical erudition. I allude, of course, to such works as that of Archbishop De Marca, 'De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii;' the 'Gallia Christiana' of the Benedictine Denis de Sainte-Marthe; the collection of ancient Gallican Councils by the Jesuit Sirmond; the 'Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina,' by Louis Thomassin, of the Oratory; and Helyot's 'Histoire des Ordres Monastiques.' To these must be added the 'Collectio Judiciorum de novis erroribus, qui ab initio XII sæculi usque ad annum MDCCXXXV in Ecclesiâ proscripti sunt,' by Charles Duplessis d'Argentré, Bishop of Tulle; a work of the highest authority, and of immense value to the historical student.

With respect to the celebrated 'Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani' of Bossuet, I may here mention that, since writing the notice of it which occurs in the text of my work, further investigation has served to convince me more thoroughly, if possible, of the authenticity of that noble apology. Count De Maistre ('De l'Eglise Gallicane,' liv. ii. chap. ix.) has discussed this question with all his characteristic acuteness and ingenuity, and has exhausted, I apprehend, the arguments by which it is sought to reduce to discredit a production so fatally subversive of Ultramontane pretensions. But I confess that his reasonings appear to me to tell against the conclusion he desires to establish. The fact that both the Bishop and Louis XIV. betrayed a disinclination to publish the 'Defensio' to the world, when we consider the principles which it enunciates, and the delicate relations existing at the moment between France and Rome, is surely no proof that it ought not to be reckoned among the genuine works of Bossuet, but rather the reverse. Upon the

hypothesis that it *does* represent the real sentiments and mature theological judgment of the great prelate, the circumstances of the case are perfectly intelligible. Bossuet is known to have entertained extreme considerateness for "the tender ears of the Romans." Both he and his royal master naturally hesitated, at the close of a lengthened and agitating contest, to commit themselves to any overt step which might excite a renewal of irritation at the Vatican. They felt, doubtless, that although it might be necessary to show, on a given occasion, that the principles of Gallicanism are capable of being successfully vindicated, there was no need to re-embark upon the sea of controversy at a conjuncture when, through the wise forbearance of the reigning Pontiff, the Church was in the way to regain the inestimable blessings of unity and peace.

With the exception of the 'Annals' of Charles Le Cointe, which extend no further than the middle of the ninth century, no connected history of the Church of France appeared till the year 1730, when the Jesuit Jacques Longueval published the first four volumes of his 'Histoire de l'Église Gallicane.' Four more volumes issued from the press in 1733 and 1734; and after the death of Longueval the work was continued by several Fathers of the same Order in succession,—Fontenay, Brumoy, and Berthier. But their united labours carried them only down to the close of the reign of Henry II. To say that these volumes discover no traces of the special theological proclivities of the authors would not be strictly true. Several controverted questions of grave import are so treated as to favour those views of the monarchical constitution of the Church, and the universal autocratic jurisdic-

tion of the Roman See, which characterize the ultra-Catholic or Curialistic school. But the general execution is so excellent, that the work must always remain a text-book for those who seek a detailed acquaintance with the fortunes of the Church in France. The Dissertations are the result of laborious original research, abound with learning, and are admirable in point of style.

Among the authorities for the ecclesiastical history of the seventeenth century, I have derived great assistance from the '*Mémoires chronologiques et dogmatiques pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique depuis 1600 jusqu'en 1716*,' which, though published anonymously, are known to be from the pen of Hyacinthe Robillard d'Avrigny, a Jesuit of Caen. The author possessed many of the highest qualities of a historian; and his power of wit and refined satire imparts to his pages an interest which never flags. The work, however, is essentially controversial. It enters at length into the details of the manifold disputes in which the Order of Loyola played so conspicuous a part, and exhibits a spirited picture of the whole course of the Jansenistic conflict. On the other hand, D'Avrigny is defective and meagre on topics relating to the interior and practical life of the Church. He has but a scanty notice of St. François de Sales. He treats the illustrious school of Port-Royal almost exclusively in its polemical aspect. He is silent as to the Apostolical character and marvellous labours of St. Vincent de Paul.

The '*Abrégé de l'histoire ecclésiastique*,' by the Abbé Bonaventure Racine, is framed on a totally different plan. All this writer's sympathies are with the Jansenists. He wrote under the special patronage of Caylus, Bishop of Auxerre, one of the last and most

zealous of the "Appellant" prelates. The earlier part of Racine's work is marked by a tone of moderation, and is extremely valuable; but the later volumes are deeply imbued with the spirit of sectarianism, and may be described as an elaborate apology for Jansenism.

The great controversy on the doctrines of Grace, which overshadowed with its sinister influence the whole of the seventeenth century and more than half of the eighteenth, was an infinitely prolific source of ecclesiastical literature. I have carefully consulted the chief works of acknowledged weight and merit on this subject, whether proceeding from the Augustinian or the Molinist camp,—from champions or opponents of the Constitution "Unigenitus." These will be found duly quoted in the foot-notes. I have, moreover, profited by the opportunity of examining a curious and probably unique collection of publications bearing on this question, which formerly belonged to a well-known Appellant ecclesiastic in one of the southern French dioceses, and is now deposited in the public library at Bayonne.

The series of MSS. in the British Museum known as the "Gualterio Papers" contains a mass of correspondence between persons who exercised more or less influence on the affairs of the Church during the critical period from 1696 to 1725. Cardinal Gualterio was Vice-legate of Avignon, and was sent as Nuncio to Paris by Pope Innocent XII. in February, 1700. He rose high in the favour of Louis XIV., who presented him to the Abbey of St. Remi at Reims. His learning and literary tastes brought him into confidential relations with the leading theologians and *savans* of France, by whom he was held in singular esteem. The Cardinal formed during his residence in France an extensive

and valuable library, which unfortunately perished at sea on the passage from Marseilles to Italy ; but at his death, in 1728, he left behind him a second collection, larger and more precious than the first. The Gualterio Papers throw much light upon the complications which arose out of the bull *Unigenitus* ; the Cardinal having been constantly in communication with Cardinals De Noailles, Fleury, D'Estrées, De Bouillon, De Bissy, and Dubois, as also with the Jesuit Lafiteau, the well-known agent of the French government at Rome.

I am bound to acknowledge gratefully my obligations to the Abbé Guettée, whose able work, '*Histoire de l'Église de France, composée sur les documents originaux et authentiques*,' has been a constant companion of my labours. The name of M. Guettée is one of well-established reputation in the ecclesiastical world, and it would be presumptuous in me to speak of him in the language of eulogy. Possibly it may not be known to some readers that certain sentiments expressed by this author on vexed questions of Church government and discipline were visited, twenty years ago, with formal censure by the See of Rome. His '*History*' was placed upon the Index of prohibited books by a decree of the Congregation in January, 1852. The Abbé employed every available means to obtain some explanation of this sentence from official quarters, but without success. It is clear, however, from the remarks prefixed to his seventh and eighth volumes, that the opinions which, in the judgment of the Roman authorities, render the work so fraught with danger to the welfare of the faithful, may be classed under three heads—the primitive organisation of the Church ; Gallicanism and Ultramontanism ; and the tribunal of the Inquisition. When we recollect that even Cardinal

Bellarmino incurred in his day a similar rebuke, on the ground of certain qualifying considerations advanced in one of his treatises as to the universal and absolute supremacy of the Pope, we shall perhaps cease to wonder at the stigma inflicted, without cause assigned, upon the Abbé Guettée. No man is better able than this accomplished divine to undertake his own defence, were the opportunity offered him of meeting specific charges of heterodoxy. As it is, he has felt constrained to take the serious and (I venture to think) questionable step of separating from the Church of his baptism, and has joined the Orthodox Communion of the East.

The paramount demand made by the educated intellect of our day upon those who take in hand to interpret the records of the past is—*truth*. The world is not inclined to accept with credulous faith narratives of which the too-perceptible purpose is to ventilate a favourite theory or to prove a foregone conclusion; nor will it longer tolerate those who would substitute the visions of imagination or conjecture for the stern realities of history. My readers will give me credit, I trust, for having aspired to ascertain the truth; but I dare not flatter myself that in all cases I have attained that end. In a work like the present, concerned so largely with the history of thought and opinion, with the prejudices and intrigues of contending parties, with transactions in which the inevitable alloy of human frailty has been systematically overlaid with a varnish of affected probity and virtue, much must be left, after all, to the independent judgment of the candid and competent reader.

Writers of history usually seek to inspire the public with a belief in their impartiality; and I am fully alive

to the value of that enviable distinction. It is to be observed, however, that impartiality does not mean indifference. The ecclesiastical inquirer is not bound to take up a position as it were *ab extra*, as if he had no personal concern or interest in the events which pass under his review. There is a pseudo-impartiality, the working of which is scarcely less detrimental to the cause of truth, especially of religious truth, than the most reckless spirit of partisanship. The style of Gibbon, for example, wears pre-eminently a calm, dispassionate, disinterested air; yet who will contend that Gibbon is in reality an impartial investigator of matters which concern the Christian Church? He affects on such topics an attitude of perfect equilibrium, without prepossession in any direction; but is he on that account a more efficient guide? Is he the better qualified, by such cynical professions, to form a satisfactory estimate of the questions *e.g.* which were debated and determined at Chalcedon? of the theory of ecclesiastical Jurisdiction? of the acts of the Council of Florence?*

To be impartial, it is not requisite, either for writers or for readers, that they should have no fixed principles, or that, having them, they should seek to conceal the fact. The essential point is, that we should not suffer our personal predilections to mislead our critical judgment, or to interfere with the supreme claims of historical truth. It should be our aim to appreciate the character of others, to enter into their views and feelings, to make all due allowance for their difficulties, to interpret their conduct in the most favourable light

* See Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, vol. ii. pp. 202-4; vol. vi. p. 28; vol. viii. p. 100 (Dr. Smith's edition, 1854).

possible. But, on the other hand, no such considerations will justify us in abdicating our own intellectual independence, or in doing violence to earnest and conscientiously-formed conviction.

Under such impressions I commend to the indulgence of the literary world a work upon which I have been engaged for several years past at no inconsiderable cost of thought and labour. None of my readers can be more sensible than myself of its many defects, and of the disproportion which it bears to the vastness of the subject which it attempts to illustrate. I am not without hope, however, that it may be found to throw additional light, in some instances, upon what has hitherto been more or less a *terra incognita* in the history of the Church; and others may perhaps be stimulated to pursue the investigation of certain questions of collateral interest, which I have been compelled to dismiss with a brief and imperfect analysis.

To the kind friends and relatives to whom I am so materially indebted for advice, criticism, and sympathy, I offer my most cordial and grateful acknowledgments.

28, HOLLAND PARK, W.

March 22, 1872.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.



INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
Nationalism in Religion	1
In what sense and to what extent legitimate	2
General character of Gallicanism	3
Early relations of Gallican Church with Rome	4, 5
Appeals to Rome. S. Leo and S. Hilary	6-8
Patriarchal jurisdiction of the Pope	9
The 'Liber Diurnus'	10
Ecclesiastical "Liberty"	11-12
Perversion of Gallican Liberty	13, 14
Ancient and Modern Gallicanism	15
Freedom of Ecclesiastical Election	16
Gallican Councils on Elections	17, 18
Changes under the Feudal System	19
Question of Investiture	20, 21
Elections by Cathedral Chapters	22
Pragmatic Sanction of Saint Louis	23
Jurisdiction of Provincial and National Councils	24-27
Interposition of the Papacy	28
Administration of Charlemagne	29, 30
Development of Papal Power	31
Extension of Appellate Jurisdiction	32
Hincmar of Reims	33
The Forged Decretals	35
Popes and Councils in the ninth century	36-39
Deposition of Arnulf of Reims	40, 41
System of Papal Legates	44-47
Disuse of Provincial Councils	46
Restrictions imposed on Legates	48
Institution of "Assemblée Générale du Clergé"	49
Ancient and Modern Synods compared	50, 51
Agens-généraux du Clergé	52
Theory of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction	53
Relations of Temporal and Spiritual Power	54-56

	PAGE
Innocent III. on Papal Jurisdiction	57
Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair	58-66
The Bull "Unam Sanctam"	67
Violence of Philip. Death of Boniface	69-70
The Ecclesiastical Courts	71
Resistance to Ecclesiastical Judges	72, 73
Aggressions of the Temporal Power	74
The "Appel comme d'abus"	75
"Droit de Régale"	77
The Popes of Avignon	79
The Great Schism of the West	80
Results of the Schism	81
Efforts of the University of Paris	82-84
France demands a General Council	85
Measures during "Soustraction d'obédience"	86
Council of Pisa	87
Gerson on General Councils	89
Council of Constance. The Decrees	90, 91
Ultramontane objections considered	92-94
Council of Basle	95
National Council of Bourges	97
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges	99
Rome opposes it	100
The Parliaments defend it	101
Pseudo-Council of Pisa	103
The Fifth Lateran Council	104
The Concordat of Bologna	105
Resistance to the Concordat	107
The Concordat registered in Parliament	109
Practical fruits of the Concordat	110-112

CHAPTER I.

Commencement of the Reformation	113
Ecclesiastical Abuses	114
Resistance to Doctrinal Changes	115
Lutheranism condemned by the Sorbonne	116
Censure of Erasmus	117
Provincial Council of Sens	118, 119
Project of a General Council	120, 121
Opening of the Council of Trent	122
Henry II. opposes the Council	124
Inconsistent policy of Henry II.	125
Suspension of the Council	126

CHAPTER II.

	PAGE
Strength of Protestantism in France	127
Character of the Reforming Movement	128
The Party Leaders	129
The Cardinal of Lorraine	130
Persecution of the Huguenots	131
Attempt to establish the Inquisition	132
Trials for Heresy	133
Conspiracy of Amboise	134
Catherine de Medicis	135
The "Tiers-parti." The Chancellor De l'Hôpital	136
The States-General of Orleans	137
Resumption of the Council of Trent	138
Queen Catherine's Letter to Pope Pius IV... .. .	139
The Colloquy of Poissy	140-145
The "Triumvirate." Outbreak of Civil War	146
French Embassy to the Council of Trent	147
The Gallican Episcopate at Trent	151
Views of the Cardinal of Lorraine	152
Debates on Episcopal Jurisdiction	153-155
Debate on Ecclesiastical Residence	156
The French "Articles of Reformation"	157
"Reformation of Secular Princes"	159-160
Resentment of the Court of France	161
French Ambassadors leave Trent	162
Measures against Bishops suspected of Heresy	163
Termination of the Council	165
Objections to its reception in France	167
Opinion of Charles Dumoulin	168
French Synods for Reception of the Council	169
Its Publication refused by French Government	170

CHAPTER III.

The "Catholic League" or "Holy Union"	172
Designs of the League	173-175
Extortions of the Crown from the Church	176
Arguments of the League	177
The Clergy and the League	178
Sixtus V. and Henry of Navarre	180
Clerical Denunciations of Henry III.	182
Outbreak of Insurrection. The Barricades	184
Assassination of the Guises	185
The Sorbonne and the League	186
Anomalous character of the League	187-188

	PAGE
Claude de Saintes	189
Génébrard Archbishop of Aix	190-191
Decline of the League	193
Conference of Suresnes	194
The "Satyre Menippée"	195
Pierre Pithou on the Gallican Liberties	196
Results of the League	197, 198

CHAPTER IV.

Conversion of Henry IV.	199
Difficulties of Henry. Boucher's Sermons	200, 201
Henry applies to Rome for Absolution	202
Ceremony of Henry's Absolution	203
Factionous conduct of the Huguenots	204
The Edict of Nantes	205
Policy of Henry towards the Huguenots	207-208
Revival of Catholicism	209
Successful Administration of Henry	210, 211

CHAPTER V.

Results of the "Wars of Religion"	212
Corruptions of the Church	213
Dilapidated Churches. Efforts of Restoration	215
Cardinal Du Perron	216
Du Perron and Duplessis-Mornay	218-220
Effects of the Conference. Isaac Casaubon	221, 222
French Cardinals	224-226
Recall of the Jesuits to France	227-232
Father Cotton	233
Jesuit Establishments. La Flèche	235
François de Sales	236-240
The Reformed Carmelites in France	241
Opposition to De Bérulle	243
Madame Acarie	245
Madame de Chantal. The Visitandines	247, 248
Cardinal De Bérulle	249
Foundation of the French Oratory	250, 251
Labours of the Oratorians	254-256

CHAPTER VI.

Assassination of Henry IV.	257
Decree of the Faculty of Theology	258
Resentment against the Jesuits	259-260

	PAGE
James I. and Cardinal Bellarmine	261
Erastianism	262
Relations between Church and State	263-264
Predominance of the Jesuits	265
Edmond Richer	266-269
The University and the Jesuits	270-272
Richer's Treatise	273
Submission of Richer	274
Condemnation of Suarez	275
Intrigues of the Great Nobles	276
Meeting of the States-General	277-281
The "Loi fondamentale"	282
Summary of proceedings	283
Speech of Richelieu	284-285
The Episcopal Manifesto	286
Antonio De Dominis	287-289

CHAPTER VII.

Louis and the States of Béarn	291
Reconciliation of Louis and the Queen Mother	292
Louis XIII. in Béarn	293
Insurrection of the Huguenots	295-296
Defeat of Louis before Montauban	297
Conversion of Marshal Lesdiguières	298
Submission of the Huguenots	299
Richelieu Prime Minister	300-301
Peace with the Huguenots	302
Policy of Richelieu	303-304
Intrigues in the Assembly of Clergy	305-306
The Parliament and the Clergy	307-308
The Parliament and the Jesuits	309-310
Censure of Santarelli	311
Siege of La Rochelle	312-314
De Bérulle and Richelieu	315-316

CHAPTER VIII.

Vincent de Paul	317-322
Retreats conducted by Vincent de Paul	323-324
"Tuesday Conferences" of St. Lazare	325-326
Filles de la Charité	327-328
Compagnie des Dames de Charité	329-330
Olier and the Seminary of S. Sulpice	331-332

CHAPTER IX.

	PAGE
Revival of the Benedictine Rule	333-334
Congregation of St. Maur	335-338
Port-Royal des Champs	339-340
The Abbess Angélique	341-342
Port-Royal de Paris	343-344
Maison du Saint-Sacrement	345-346

CHAPTER X.

Ecclesiastical Policy of Richelieu	347
His differences with the Court of Rome	348
Outcry for a Gallican Synod	349
“Preuves des libertés de l’Église Gallicane”	350
“Optatus Gallus”	351
De Marca “De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii”	352
The “Diabes de Loudun”	353, 354
Urbain Grandier	355-356
Affair of the Marriage of the Duke of Orleans	357-358
Gallican Clergy on Royal Marriages	359-360
Mission of Bishop Fenouillet to Rome	361-362
Unjust Taxation of the Clergy	363
Richelieu and the Abbé de St. Cyran	364
The Jesuits and the Bishop of Chalcedon	365-366
St. Cyran—‘Petrus Aurelius’	367
St. Cyran Imprisoned at Vincennes	374
Death of Cardinal Richelieu	375
Death of the Abbé de St. Cyran	376

CHAPTER XI.

Commencement of the Jansenistic Controversy	377
Augustine on Grace and Free-will	378-380
Reaction from Augustinianism	381
Doctrine of the Council of Trent	382
System of Molina	383-384
The Congregation “de Auxiliis”	385
Publication of the ‘Augustinus’ of Jansenius	386
The Bull “In eminenti”	387
Antoine Arnauld defends Jansenius	389
Arnauld ‘De la fréquente Communion’	390-394
Intrigues against Antoine Arnauld	395-396
Letter of Bishops to Urban VIII. in favour of Arnauld	397

	PAGE
Proselytes to Jansenism	399-400
Rivalry of Jansenists and Molinists	401
The "Five Propositions"	403
The Bishops appeal to the Pope	405-406
The Propositions examined at Rome	407-408
Arguments of the Jansenist Deputies	409
Grounds of the Decision	411

CHAPTER XII.

The Bull "Cum occasione"	412-414
Reception of the Bull in France	415
Policy of Cardinal Mazarin	416
Evasive system of the Jansenists	417-418
Report of the Assembly of Clergy	419
Persecution of Port-Royal	420
Affair of the Duc de Liancourt	421-422
Arnauld's 'Letters to a Duke and Peer'	423
Arnauld condemned by the Sorbonne	424-425
Deprivation of Arnauld	426-427

CHAPTER XIII.

Pascal's 'Provincial Letters'	428-434
Miracle of the "Sainte Épine"	435-438
Proceedings against the Casuists	439
Father Pirot's 'Apology'	440
Censure of the 'Provincial Letters'	441-442
Pascal on le "Droit" et le "Fait"	443
Death of Pascal and of his sister Jacqueline	444

CHAPTER XIV.

The Clergy and the Formulary	445-446
Antoine Arnauld and Pavillon Bishop of Alet	447
Theory of Papal Infallibility	448-449
Death of Cardinal Mazarin	450
Religious Policy of Louis XIV.	451
Persecution of the two Convents of Port-Royal	452
The Formulary enforced at Port-Royal	453-454
Episcopal opposition to the Formulary	455
Dispute between Louis XIV. and Rome. The Six Articles	456
Negotiation for Peace	457
The Bishop of Comminges and Father Ferrier	458
Abortive issue of the Conferences	460

	PAGE
The Formulary enforced by Royal Edict	461
Archbishop Péréfixe at Port-Royal	462, 464
The Bull "Regiminis Apostolici"	465
Prosecution of the Four Bishops	466
Accession of Pope Clement IX.	467
Letter to the Pope in defence of the Four Bishops	468
Letter of the Four Bishops to the Gallican Episcopate	469
Progress of the Negotiation for restoring Peace	470
Letter of the Four Bishops to Clement IX.	471
The "Peace of Clement IX."	472-476

THE GALLICAN CHURCH.

INTRODUCTION.

I.

RELIGIOUS NATIONALITY—religion in a shape peculiar to one section of the human family, or one territorial circumscription of the globe—is, *primâ facie*, an idea foreign to the genius of Christianity. Nations, viewed in the light of the new federal relations established by the Gospel, are not independent, but interdependent. Judaism was a national religion, localized, isolated, geographically limited; but the Kingdom of Christ is world-wide. The Church Catholic takes no note of any distinctions of physical race, except to obliterate and extinguish them. That vast “net which is cast into the sea” of the moral creation, and “gathered of every kind,”—that common home of redeemed humanity, “where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free”—is essentially the same to all whom it embraces, however widely they may differ as to primitive descent or social organization. They who “by one Spirit are all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit,” are strictly “fellow citizens” in the Christian sense of the word, whether their lot be cast in the temperate or the torrid zone—whether they be classified, after the order of nature, as Celtic or Teutonic, Aryan or Aramean. The curse of Babel is revoked by the Pentecostal benediction; and “the whole earth,” in so far as it is Christian, is again “of one language and of one speech.”

At the same time it is clear that Christianity, while unchangeable in essence, is to a certain extent plastic in application. It admits of some variety in outward development and administrative detail. It is not uninfluenced by the innate qualities of the soil in which it grows; it adapts itself to the material with which it has to deal. The Church Catholic, wherever it has fixed its sojourn among men, has been coloured

more or less by the moral atmosphere and other exceptional influences with which it has been brought into contact. Such distinctions have arisen in all lands, and in all ages, from the very facts of ethnology—from the diversities of natural origin.

In this sense, then, a certain element of nationality is not only admissible in religion, but inevitable; and the existence of “Gallicanism,” properly so called, is no surprising phenomenon. Gallicanism is (or, to speak more accurately, *was*) the Christianity of the French people. It may be expected, then, *à priori*, to exhibit traits corresponding with the idiosyncrasy of that noble race; features reflecting and illustrating its characteristic self-reliance, its love of liberty, its impatience of foreign domination, its reverence for traditional authority and time-honoured usage.

Thus the question of Nationalism in religion resolves itself into one of degree and detail. The principle is legitimate within certain limits; but what are those limits?

Manifestly they must be so defined as to leave intact the field of essential theological doctrine. Within that sacred area there is no scope for Nationalism. Peculiarities which touch the foundations of the Faith—the Catholic tradition of all ages—the “*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,”—such peculiarities are well-nigh synonymous with heresies. To say that the tenets known as “Gallican” are not of this complexion may seem almost superfluous; yet such is the predominant tone of thought and feeling in the Roman Communion of our day, that the statement is not altogether uncalled for. It is notorious that the profession of Gallican opinions is now, and has long been, treated in certain quarters as if it were all but equivalent to a denial of the Faith. What, however, is the real character of those opinions? They belong to the domain of ecclesiastical polity; relating chiefly to the nature and extent of the authority vested in the Apostolic See, and in the individual person of its Bishop. They may be said, also, to comprehend many collateral issues, radiating from this central point—issues affecting jurisprudence, legislation, discipline; the status and rights of the Episcopal Order in general; the legitimate terms of alliance between a National Church and a Christian State.

Now these are questions, doubtless, of considerable magnitude; but they are not of fundamental or indispensable moment.

They are not questions *de fide*.* The systematic exaggeration of their importance by the extreme partisans of Rome is one of the most unfortunate features of modern controversy. It is difficult to see how the cause of religion can be served by insisting on the dogma of Papal absolutism as if it were the corner-stone of the whole Christian fabric—the “*articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*.” Such a theory clashes with incontestable facts. If this be an article of necessary faith, how is it that it has never been imposed upon the conscience of Christendom by the authority of any one undisputed Œcumenical Council?† How is it that no such definition is to be found among the decrees of Trent? How is it that those who reject it have never in any age been branded with the anathemas incurred by formal heresy?

The champions of Gallicanism are scarce in the nineteenth century; but in days bygone, when it was first attempted to introduce the system now so well known as that of the Roman Curia, they exhibited no lack of energy and ardour. Collisions were inevitable; and the thunders of the fray, on certain memorable occasions, reverberated through the very heart of Christendom. It is satisfactory to reflect, however, on looking down the vista of ages, that the truths so strenuously contended

* This is acknowledged by no less an authority than Cardinal Du Perron, in his reply to James I. of England, as quoted by Bossuet, *Def. Declarat. Cler. Gallic.*, Præv. Dissert. lxxxix. “*Quæstio de auctoritate Papæ inter Catholicos agitata, sive in spiritualibus respectu Conciliorum Œcumenicorum, sive in temporalibus respectu jurisdictionum sæcularium, quatenus salutis animarum obsunt, non est quæstio ejusmodi quæ res complexatur ab alterutrâ parte inter articulos fidei recensitas, aut ab eis exigatur qui ad Ecclesiam redeant, ita ut alii alios pro hæreticis habeant, aut à se mutuo quoad communionis vinculum separentur. Quare ea omnia communioni ecclesiasticæ sanciendæ impedimento esse non possunt, cum ejus conditionis sint, ut quæcumque partem Rex serenissimus amplectatur, haud eò secius ab utrâque parte jus et nomen Catholicæ obtineat.*”

† The Council of Florence, as the reader need scarcely be reminded, is not “undisputed.” It was never received by the Church of France. Moreover,

the famous decree of that assembly by no means establishes the modern doctrine of Papal autocracy, though it is perpetually cited for that purpose. The power of governing the universal Church, there attributed to the Pope, is carefully limited by the words which follow—words which were inserted because the Eastern bishops would not subscribe the decree without them: *Καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κανόσι διαλαμβάνεται*. “In that manner which is laid down both in the acts of the Œcumenical Councils and in the sacred canons.” This inconvenient clause has been garbled in the Latin version by certain critics, who, by the slight change of *et* into *etiam*, contrive to make it imply precisely the reverse of what was intended. The trick has been repeatedly exposed; see especially J. de Launoï, *Epistola ad Christoph. Fauvæum*, *Epp.* P. 1^{ma} p. 348. Another favourite device is to quote the first part of the decree, suppressing this most significant paragraph altogether.

for by the far-famed school of Gallican divines were maintained without any open breach of Catholic communion or dereliction of the Rule of Faith. Nor, although the current may seem to have set in an opposite direction in the Latin Church of our own and one or two preceding generations, is there any cause for apprehension as to the enduring vitality of their theology. Principles which have survived the desolations of the great Calvinist schism, the corroding ulcer of Jansenism, and the hurricane of an infidel Revolution, can scarcely have much to fear from the ravages of time.

II.

The Gallican Church, from the very dawn of its history, cordially recognized the primacy, and in a certain sense the supremacy, of Rome among the Episcopal Sees of Christendom. It was to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, that the Martyrs of Lyons addressed a celebrated letter, appealing to him for aid in confuting the heresy of Montanus.* The bearer of that letter was Irenæus, then a Presbyter, afterwards Bishop of Lyons, and one of the brightest luminaries of the early Church in Gaul. From a much-contested passage in the treatise of this father "Against heresies" we may at least infer (after making every allowance for the imperfect state in which the work has come down to us) that he regarded the Roman See—"that greatest and most ancient Church founded by the two glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul"—with deep reverence and honour, both on account of its pre-eminent dignity, and on account of the fidelity with which it had preserved and handed down the Divine Deposit through twelve successive episcopates.† Similar conclusions

* Euseb., *H. E.*, Lib. v. 4, 5. Longueval, *Hist. de l'Egl. Gallic.*, tom. i. p. 19.

† Iren., *Contr. Hæres.*, III. cap. 3. § 2. The greater part of the original text of Irenæus being lost, we are dependent on an uncouth and possibly inaccurate Latin translation. Under these circumstances such expressions as "propter potiorum (or potentiorum) principalitatem," and "ad hanc ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam," lie fairly open to criticism. Accordingly, Irenæus is confidently claimed on one side as an asserter of the absolute monarchy of the Roman Pontiff over the universal Church;

while on the other his meaning is jealously minimised into a mere acknowledgment of Rome as a Church of the highest antiquity and Apostolic foundation. Fénelon (*De summi Pontificis auctoritate*, cap. 10) adopts a middle course, and understands the passage to imply the indefectibility of Rome in holding fast the deposit of faith. Such, too, is Bossuet's view (*Defen. Declarat.*, P. III., Lib. x. c. 6.) In his Sermon "Sur l'Unité de l'Eglise," however, he translates the word "convenire" by "s'accorder." "C'est avec cette Eglise que toutes les Eglises et tous les fideles qui sont par toute la terre doivent s'accorder,"

may be drawn from the proceedings of the First Council of Arles (A.D. 314). The fathers there assembled transmitted their canons with profound respect to Pope Sylvester, in order that (as they express it in their synodical epistle) "by him, who presided over the greater dioceses, they might be notified to the Christian world."* At the same time it is evident, both from their words and acts, that they considered the Council to possess inherently all necessary power of legislation, apart from any exercise of authority on the part of the Roman Pontiff.

The all-important principle of appeal to the Apostolic See in the "*causæ majores*"—the pivot, as it proved eventually, of the whole system of Papal domination—began to prevail in Gaul in the early part of the fifth century. Mention is made of it in a decretal epistle of Pope Innocent I. to Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, A.D. 404. In reply to certain enquiries of that prelate on matters of discipline, the Pope directs, among other things, that ecclesiastical causes shall be judged, according to the canons of Nicæa, by the Provincial Council, and that none shall be permitted to decline its jurisdiction in order to seek justice elsewhere;—"without prejudice," he adds, "to the rights of the Roman Church, for which in all proceedings due respect must be observed. If greater causes should arise, they must be reserved, after the sentence of the bishops has been pronounced, to the

à cause de sa principale et excellente principauté.' —*Œuvres*, tom. xv. p. 521. For the Protestant interpretation, see David Blondel, *Traité de la Primauté en l'Eglise*, p. 17 et seq. This locus vexatus is certainly capable of more than one construction as to doctrine; but its general sense as illustrating a historical fact is, I conceive, sufficiently obvious. The recent version in the "Ante-Nicene Library" renders it thus: "It is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority." There is now little doubt among scholars that the original reading of this latter phrase was *διὰ τὴν διαφορωτέραν ἀρχήν*.

* "Dilectissimo Papæ Silvestro. Ad Arelatensem civitatem piissimi Imperatoris voluntate adducti, indè te, gloriosissime Papa, communitâ reverentiâ salutamus. Placuit enim à te, qui majores Diœceses tenes, et per te potissimum

omnibus insinuari." This Council of Arles was attended by bishops from all parts of the Latin Church, and was virtually a General Council of the West. The phrase "*majores diœceses*" probably refers to the greater number and extent of the "*diœceses*" (*i. e.* the political divisions of the empire, so called) contained in the Patriarchate of Rome, as compared with those of the East. Seven "*diœceses*," if not more, were subject to the Roman jurisdiction (*De Marca, De Concord.*, Lib. v. c. 19). F. Longueval (*Hist. de l'Egl. Gallic.*, tom. ii. p. 184) concurs in regarding the language of this Council as amounting to a recognition of Sylvester as patriarch of the West. Whether these territorial details had been precisely arranged at that early date is perhaps questionable; but in any case we have here sufficient proof of the high position and prerogative assigned even then to the see of St. Peter.

Holy See, in pursuance of the injunctions of the Council.”* Not many years afterwards we meet with a remarkable instance of appeal to Rome on the part of a Gallican bishop, the results of which went far to settle the usage of the Western Church in this particular.

A dispute of long standing existed between the bishops of Arles and Vienne with regard to precedency and metropolitical jurisdiction. The question was brought before a Council at Turin in the year 401, when it was decided, for the sake of peace, that the dignity of metropolitan should belong to that prelate who could prove his see to be the civil capital of the province; and that, meanwhile, each should execute the office in the dioceses nearest to his own.† The strife was thus suspended for the time; but in 417 Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, addressed himself to Pope Zosimus, to obtain restitution of the rights which he maintained to be originally inherent in his see; and that Pontiff, probably without sufficient examination, granted his request. He wrote to the bishops of Gaul, directing that the Bishop of Arles should exercise metropolitan jurisdiction over three provinces, Viennensis and 1^{ma} and 2^{da} Narbonensis; that he should preside at the consecration of their bishops; that all clergy travelling abroad should obtain from him “litteræ formatæ,” or commendatory letters; and that he should decide ecclesiastical causes, with the exception of those which were important enough to be reserved to the cognizance of the Pope himself.‡ These distinctions he declared to rest upon the Apostolic foundation of the See; Trophimus having been despatched from Rome to be the first Bishop of Arles, and the Christian faith having been diffused from that original source throughout Gaul.§

* Innoc., *Epist. ad Victric. Rotomag.* ap. Sirmond, *Conc. Antig. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 30. Longueval, *Hist. de l'Egl. Gallie.*, tom. ii. p. 47. By “the Council,” Innocent means that of Sardica, A.D. 347; which, as is well known, laid down the earliest regulations as to the practice of appealing to the Roman See. The canons of Sardica were frequently confounded with those of Nicæa, the one Council being regarded as the continuation of the other. Cf. Ballerin., *Append. ad. S. Leon. Opp.* Pt. II. p. 57.

† Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. ii. p. 1155; Sirmond, *Concil. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 27.

‡ Sirmond, *Conc. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 42. De Marca, *De Concord.*, Lib. v. cap. 30 § 5. Fleury, *H. E.*, Liv. xxiii. § 45.

§ Zosim., *Ep. ad universos Episcopos Gallie.* “Jussimus præcipuam, sicuti semper habuit, Metropolitanus episcopus Arelatensium civitatis in ordinandis sacerdotibus teneat auctoritatem . . . Metropolitanæ Arelatensium urbi vetus privilegium minimè derogandum est, ad quam primum ex hac sede Trophimus summus Antistes, ex cujus fonte totæ Gallie fidei rivulos acceperunt, directus est.” The date of the mission of Tro-

But this judgment by no means put an end to the dispute. The very complicated case of Hilary, Bishop of Arles, during the Pontificate of Leo the Great, reopened the whole question; and all parties interested recurred repeatedly to Rome. Hilary was accused to the Pope of assuming primatial authority over the whole Gallic Church, and in particular, of having unlawfully deposed Celidonius, apparently a bishop of the province of Vienne. Celidonius appealed to the Pope; and Hilary himself proceeded forthwith to Rome, where he demeaned himself towards his superior in a somewhat-arrogant and unbecoming style. Leo assembled his Council, reversed Hilary's judgment, and reinstated Celidonius, who seems to have been innocent of the offence imputed to him. Hence we may infer that the regulations of the Council of Sardica on appeals were at this period either unrecognized or very imperfectly observed.* Had they been in full operation, Hilary would not have been justified on his part in complaining of Celidonius

phimus to Gaul, and of the foundation of the see of Arles, has been the subject of much controversy. Pope Zosimus does not expressly identify him with the Trophimus of Scripture; and although the bishops of the province of Arles, in their epistle to Pope Leo, (*Conc. Antiq. Gall.* tom. i. p. 89), state that S. Trophimus was sent to Gaul "by the most blessed apostle St. Peter," this need not mean more than that he was sent by the authority of the bishop of Rome, St. Peter's successor. Later, however, in the same epistle, they say distinctly that Trophimus was sent "by the Apostles." De Marca, in his "Epist. ad. Henricum Valesium" (*De Concord.*, tom. iv.), contends for the Apostolic institution of the see; but the opposite opinion is ably maintained by De Launoï, in his "Disputatio Epistolæ de tempore quo primum in Galliis suscepta est Christi fides" (*Opusc.* tom. v.). The latter view rests chiefly on the testimony of S. Gregory of Tours, according to whom Trophimus was one of a band of missionaries sent to Gaul by Pope Fabian, in the consulate of Decius, A.D. 250. This is far the more probable account. Tillemont and Balzerini consider that Zosimus was imposed upon by Patroclus and others in his interest, who invented the story of the Apostolic mission of Trophimus for

the purpose of supporting the high-flown pretensions of the see of Arles.

* F. Quesnel *Dissert. V. Apol. pro S. Hilario, S. Leon., Opp.*, tom. ii. p. 833, argues that the Gallican Church, following the example of the African and the Eastern churches, did not receive the canons of the Council of Sardica. Had those canons formed part of the Gallican code, Pope Leo, he remarks, would certainly have referred to them on the present occasion, since the right of Celidonius to appeal to the Roman See would thus be established beyond dispute. Quesnel's object, of course, is to show that the appellate jurisdiction of Rome was unknown to antiquity, and that the assumption of such power was resisted with special vigour in Gaul. But it would appear that the tradition of the Church had to some extent established that prerogative antecedently to any positive enactment of statute law. It was looked upon as an inherent attribute of the primacy of the bishop of Rome as successor of St. Peter. St. Leo speaks of it, in his celebrated Epistle to the bishops of the province of Vienne, as an ancient custom, a standing rule of the Church, for the purpose of preserving the bond of Christian charity, and uniformity of ecclesiastical discipline. "Nobiscum

for carrying his suit to Rome, nor, on the other hand, could the Pope have adjudicated the cause without previously referring it to a Commission on the spot for a second examination. Leo, however, was not content with rescinding Hilary's decision; he visited him with severe censure, deprived him of the Primacy granted to his predecessor,* declared him to be severed from the communion of the Holy See, and intimated that it was a matter of favour that he was not deposed from his office.† It was on this occasion, too, that the Pontiff procured from Valentinian III. an edict affirming his supremacy in the government of the Church, forbidding the bishops, whether in Gaul or other provinces, to vary from ancient custom without his permission, and enjoining his officers, civil and military, to enforce submission to the Pope in case of need. ‡

The question between Arles and Vienne was decided by Pope

vestra fraternitas recognoscat, Apostolicam Sedem pro sui reverentiâ à vestrâ etiam provinciâ sacerdotibus innumeris relationibus esse consultam, et per diversarum, quemadmodum vetus consuetudo poscebat, appellationes causarum aut retractata aut confirmata esse judicia; adeo ut servatâ unitate spiritus in vinculo pacis, commeantibus hinc inde litteris, quod sanctè agebatur perpetuè proficeret caritati." There was no need for him to quote the Sardican canons (especially as he had not acted in accordance with them, when he could appeal to the fact that these very bishops and their predecessors had been constantly accustomed to address themselves to the Holy See in matters requiring final arbitration. That the canons in question, if not known to the Gallican Church of that age, were subsequently not only received, but zealously insisted on, in France, is acknowledged on all hands.

* This seems to have been previously revoked by Pope Boniface. "*Cum et ipsum quod Patroclo à sede Apostolicâ temporaliter videbatur esse concessum, postmodum sit sententiâ meliore sublatum*" (S. Leon., *Epist.* x. cap. 4).

† S. Leon., *Epist.* x. cap. 7, *Ad Episc. Provinc. Vienn.* The phrase "*Exsors Apostolicæ communionis*" probably refers not to any sentence of excommunication, but to Hilary's clandestine

flight from Rome, by which he had shut himself out from participation in the religious rites and synodal acts of his brother prelates.

‡ *Constitutio Valentiniani III. Augusti, De Episcoporum ordinatione.*—S. Leon., *Opp.*, tom. i. p. 642. It is addressed to the patrician Aetius, commander of the troops in Gaul. It states that Hilary, called Bishop of Arles, had rashly usurped the power of judging and ordaining bishops without consulting the Roman Pontiff. Some he had illegally removed, others he had ordained against the will of the citizens. Sentence had been passed against him by the Pope, and that sentence would be valid even without confirmation by the Emperor. "*Quid enim tanti Pontificis auctoritati in ecclesiis non liceret!*" But lest Hilary, or any one else, should venture to offend again in like manner, he decrees, as a perpetual rule that neither the bishops of Gaul nor of other provinces shall attempt any innovation upon ancient custom without the sanction of the "venerable Pope of the Eternal City." "*Hoc illis omnibusque pro lege sit, quidquid sanxit vel sanxerit Apostolicæ Sedis auctoritas; ita ut quisquis Episcoporum ad iudicium Romani Antistitis evocatus venire neglexerit, per Moderatorem ejusdem provinciæ adesse cogatur.*"

Leo in the year 449. He observes, in reply to a memorial from the bishops of the province of Vienne, that the two Sees had enjoyed precedence alternately; special privileges having been conferred sometimes on the one, sometimes on the other. For this reason he judged it right to make a division of the contested jurisdiction. He assigns to the Bishop of Vienne the four neighbouring dioceses of Valence, Tarantaise, Geneva, and Grenoble; the remaining sees of the same province being placed under the authority of the Bishop of Arles.* Subsequent Pontiffs, however, conferred various important prerogatives on the Metropolitans of Arles. They were appointed Vicars and Legates of the Holy See; invested with the pallium as the symbol of that office; and empowered to convoke and preside at Councils throughout Gaul. St. Caesarius was the first who received the distinction of the pallium. Pope Symmachus confirmed to him at the same time (A.D. 513) all the privileges belonging to his See and exercised by his predecessors, and even extended his jurisdiction into Spain.†

From the time of Leo the Great the Popes may be said to have possessed a generally acknowledged patriarchal authority throughout the Gallic Church. Nor does it appear that the administration of the Roman Patriarch, in the form established in those early ages, was on the whole inconsistent with the legitimate principles of Church Government. On the contrary, it tended materially to the maintenance of unity and discipline in times of great political disorder and social danger. The Pope was universally admitted to be the first bishop of Christendom; but his government was that of a constitutional, not of an absolute, monarch. His Patriarchal dignity was held in common with that of four other Patriarchs, and was not as yet developed into a Primacy of universal jurisdiction. He did not claim to be the sole source of ecclesiastical legislation; he did not pretend to be independent of Councils and canons. The Popes of those days were in the habit of reiterating on all occasions, and with every variety of expression, the fact that they were the guardians of the statute law of the Church; that they had no power to alter or abrogate those statutes;

* S. Leon., *Epist.* lxvi. (al. l.), tom. i. p. 998.

† Sirmond, *Conc. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. p.

187; Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, I. Lib. ii. cap. 54.

that it was the peculiar characteristic and glory of the Roman See to maintain inviolate the tradition of antiquity and the canonical decrees of Councils. A great Gallican doctor, Jean de Launoi, has taken the pains to collect a series of sixty-three declarations to this effect from the writings of different Popes; in which they acknowledge themselves to be bound, by special obligations, to conform personally to the legislation of the Church, and to enforce its authority throughout the Christian world.* The same principle is further illustrated, with singular force, by the '*Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*,'† which contains the formulas by which the Popes of all ages have engaged, at their inauguration, to observe to the very letter (*usque*

* Launoi., *Epistol.* Pars iii. Ep. ad Thomam Rullandum.

† The '*Liber Diurnus*' is a collection of official formularies relating to points of ecclesiastical discipline and administration, anciently in use in the Roman Chancery. It appears from internal and external evidence to date from the end of the 7th century. In the course of ages it became obsolete, and fell into oblivion, insomuch that Antonio Augustin, the great Spanish canonist in the 16th century, was not aware of its existence. At length a MS. copy was discovered by Luke Holstein, afterwards librarian of the Vatican, in the church of Sta. Croce di Gerusalemme at Rome, about the year 1645. Holstein collated it with a second MS. belonging to the library of the Collège de Clermont at Paris, and prepared an edition for publication; but the Papal censors of the press declined, on various pretexts, to grant the requisite permission. Holstein died in 1661, and nothing more was heard of the *Liber Diurnus* till 1680, when it suddenly made its appearance in print under the auspices of Father Garnier, a learned Jesuit of Paris, librarian of the Collège de Clermont. This step gave umbrage at Rome, and Garnier was summoned thither to account for his conduct; but he died during the journey, at Bologna, in October, 1681. The obnoxious volume narrowly escaped being put upon the Index, and copies of it became extremely rare. During the Pontificate of Benedict XIII., however, the susceptibilities of the Roman court as to certain facts

referred to in the *Liber Diurnus* underwent considerable abatement; and in 1724 it was reprinted from the edition of Garnier, though with such precautions as effectually prevented its getting into general circulation. Since then it has often reappeared in learned collections; but the most complete edition is that recently published at Paris by M. Eugène de Rozière, Inspecteur-Général des Archives. The editor has prefixed a most interesting Introduction, to which I am indebted for the foregoing details.

The reader to whom this story is new will be curious to learn why the court of Rome should have taken so much pains to hinder the *Liber Diurnus* from seeing the light. The following seems to be the true explanation:—Among the documents contained in the volume, perhaps the most important is the "*Professio Romani Pontificis*," or solemn declaration of faith made by the Popes at their enthronization. Three forms of it are preserved; in one of which, the second, mention is made of Pope Honorius, who, as is well known, was denounced as a heretic by the Sixth General Council for his weak complicity with the Monothelites. The occurrence of this awkward passage in the *Professio* is quite sufficient to account for the reluctance of the authorities at Rome to sanction its publication to the world. Cardinal Bona, to whom the work was submitted for examination, candidly gave this as his reason for recommending that Holstein's edition should be suppressed, "*Cùm in professione electi Pontificis*

ad unum apicem) the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils; to affirm and teach whatever the Church in her legislative assemblies has affirmed and taught; to condemn and reject whatever has been synodically condemned and rejected by the same authority.* That any Pope should deliberately violate or set aside the enactments of general Councils was a contingency scarcely contemplated by the ancient Church. For such enactments were presumed to be made under the immediate sanction and direction of the Roman Patriarch; so that, in opposing them, he would be resisting and annulling his own acts.

It was only in proportion as these grave truths began to be forgotten in the rapid aggrandizement which was almost thrust upon the Papacy after the fall of the Carlovingian Empire, that National Churches found it necessary to recur to the provisions of immemorial discipline, and to insist on the observance of their ancient "liberties."

Ecclesiastical "liberty" is a phrase which has become in great

damnetur Honorius Papa idè quia pravis hæreticorum assertionibus fomentum impendit, si verba delineata sint verè in autographo, nec ex notis apparere possit quomodo huic vulneri medelam afferat, præstat non divulgari opus." Father Sirmond agreed with him in opinion. (*See De Rozière, Introduction*, p. 113.)

The case of Honorius must always be one of crucial difficulty to those who are committed to the extreme ultramontane dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope. Human ingenuity has been taxed to the utmost to elude the verdict of history upon the point, but in vain. It has been asserted by various advocates (1), that the acts of the Council were falsified; (2), that the judgment of the Council was mistaken; (3), that Honorius misunderstood the question at issue, and that his opinion was orthodox, though irrelevant to the controversy; (4), that in his letters to Sergius he was speaking not *ex Cathedra*, but only as a private theologian; (5), that although justly condemned, he was not condemned for heresy, but only for giving countenance to heretics. These are pleas which have been often and unanswerably refuted. But although the fall of Honorius is fatal to the claim of personal infallibility, it concludes nothing

against that advanced by Bossuet and other Gallican divines, namely, that the See of St. Peter is *indefectible* in preserving and transmitting the deposit of faith. According to them a marked distinction must be observed between the Roman See and the individual who occupies it. An individual Pope may err, but the taint will be transient, and can never take permanent root in the Apostolic See; the "faith of Peter" will unfailingly survive to the end of time, by virtue of Christ's promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.

* "*Sancta Universalia Concilia, Nicænum, Constantinopolitanum, Ephesinum primum, &c., usque ad unum apicem immutata servare; quæque prædicaverunt, prædicare, quæque condemnaverunt, ore et corde condemnare. Diligentius autem et vivacius, quamdiu vixero, omnia decreta canonica prædecessorum nostrorum Pontificum, quæcunque ipsi synodally statuerunt, et probata sunt, confirmare et indiminuta servare, et sicut ab eis statuta sunt, in sui vigoris stabilitate custodire; quæque vel quoscunque condemnaverunt vel abdicaverunt simili sententiâ condemnare vel abdicare.*" This "Professio" is inserted in Gratian's *Decretum*, Dist. xvi. c. 8. It is also twice quoted by Ivo of Chartres.

measure identified with the history of the Church in France; but it must be observed that, in the claims originally advanced in that behalf, there was nothing peculiar to any single member of the Christian Commonwealth. All that was demanded was this; that the constitutional charter—the “common law”—of the Church should be obeyed in practice.* Freedom of episcopal election; the unshackled exercise of metropolitan jurisdiction; the regular celebration of Councils, especially of Provincial Councils; the administration of discipline through the ecclesiastical courts, unimpeded either by the arbitrary control of the State or by the indefinite multiplication of appeals to Rome;—such were the franchises vindicated by Gallican theologians; not, however, as belonging exclusively to France, but as component parts of that Divinely-bequeathed heritage which is the property of the Church universal. The selfsame objects were anxiously pursued in other quarters of the Christian world; but nowhere was the resistance to innovation so steadily sustained, so discriminating, or on the whole so successful, as in France. Hence the special significance of the term “liberty” as applied to the Gallican branch of the Church Catholic.† Other nations of Europe fell into excesses in opposite directions; excesses either of blind abject submission to the Papal autocracy, as in Italy and Spain; or of rebellion ending in the disruption of visible unity, as in Germany and England. The tone maintained in France was for the most part dignified, temperate, respectful; combining a resolute assertion of the principles both of civil and ecclesiastical freedom, with profound devotion to the Patriarchal See of the West, and with obedience to its occupants in all things lawfully enjoined.

Thus the distinctive truths illustrated by the Gallican Church of former days were principally these:—that a National Church, while following the broad track of Latin tradition as to the primacy of the “*Cathedra Petri*,” may witness at the same time to the co-ordinate power of government which resides by Divine

* “*Nativas Ecclesiæ Catholicæ libertates, sive jus commune à Deo et naturâ institutum.*”—Edm. Richer, *De Eccles. et Polit. Potestate*, cap. 13. Cf. De Marca, *De Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, Lib. iii. cap. 1, § 7.

† “*Debilitatâ in cæteris regnis canonum auctoritate, ut significaretur apud nos aliquam partem canonicæ libertatis retineri, libertatis Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ speciale nomen inductum est.*”—De Marca, *De Concord.* ubi supra.

right in the whole Episcopal college; that the Canon Law, not the will of a personally infallible Pontiff, is the standard of the Church's jurisprudence; that it is possible to hold the doctrinal creed committed to the Church from the beginning, without acquiescing in Roman usurpations in other departments of the ecclesiastical economy;—in short, that, in order to be Catholic, it is not absolutely necessary to be Ultramontane.

It cannot be denied, however, that Gallicanism may be contemplated from a very different and far less advantageous point of view. The position occupied by France in regard to the Papacy was not devoid of serious countervailing drawbacks. The Gallican Church freed itself, to a certain extent, from the tyrannical yoke of Rome; but this partial emancipation was purchased only at the price of momentous concessions to the State. "Gallican liberty"—if it signified that constitutional autonomy which is the birthright of the Church Catholic,—was indeed worth any sacrifice; but what if liberty should be craftily transformed into servitude* by the domineering action of the civil power? The Pope, though he might sometimes make an oppressive and mistaken use of his prerogatives, was nevertheless the chief Pastor of the Church—one whose spiritual character and Divine commission could not be disputed. But in proportion as attempts were made to repress the exorbitant pretensions of ambitious Pontiffs, the door was opened for intrusion on the part of another Element, which, although sovereign in things temporal, possessed no spiritual authority or jurisdiction whatever.

Hence arose an arduous struggle, which was prolonged for centuries, if indeed it can be said even now to be finally decided. Its general result is written on the face of history too plainly to be mistaken. Whatever was wrested from the Pope was appropriated by the Crown. So that, in process of time, while stoutly protesting against any recognition of Pontifical supremacy in things temporal, the French Church found itself reduced to the anomalous necessity of accepting the Royal supremacy in many things intrinsically spiritual.

Under such circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that

* "Servitutes potius quàm libertates." See the letter of the Gallican bishops in 1639.—*Procès-verbaux*, &c., tom. iii., *Pièces justificatives*, No. 1.

the phrase "Gallican liberty" has become ambiguous, and is used in two different acceptations. In its primary and genuine sense it implies the right of the Gallican Church (as of all national churches) to administer its own government within certain limits—those limits being determined by the canons of Councils and the practice of the purest ages of antiquity. But the same term was applied, in later times, to the assumptions of the State in matters extraneous to its proper province, under pretence of maintaining national independence as against the usurpations of the Papacy. Ultramontane controversialists are glad to avail themselves of this convenient équivoque. They studiously ignore the ancient, unadulterated Gallicanism, and seek to persuade us that the system known by that name was fabricated by a royal despot and his sycophant bishops towards the close of the seventeenth century. They confound the abuses which arose from the absolutism of the Crown with that primitive organization which in all ages has confronted the absolutism of Rome.

Against this artifice the reader will do well to be on his guard. We hear it loudly proclaimed in these days that Gallicanism is the base-born offspring of a degenerate age—a "schism in disguise"—an outbreak of the spirit of insubordination—incoherent, illogical. The reply to such assertions is best made by distinguishing between the apocryphal version of it which was imposed upon the world by despotic monarchs, arrogant ministers, and obsequious parliaments, and that pure theological tradition which was coeval with the Church of France. Gallicanism (in its true sense) does not date from the "age of Louis XIV." It did not originate with the "Declaration" of 1682. It was not created by the Concordat of Francis I. It was not first formulated in the "Pragmatic Sanction" of Bourges. Nor was it even a happy invention of the illustrious Jean Gerson and those other kindred spirits who piloted the Church with such consummate skill through the shoals and quicksands of the "Great Schism." It sounds like a truism to say so, but the truism is necessary—the Gallican Church was *always* Gallican. It was not, indeed, always in an attitude of active protest against the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff; for that supremacy, rightly understood and administered, is an integral part of the Gallican polity. But it asserted from the beginning those great laws and prin-

ciples, the infraction of which in later times led to the divergence between the old and the new ecclesiastical discipline. If Gallicans began at a certain period to dissent from Rome, it was because Rome at that period had become other than she was. Ultramontanism, not Gallicanism, was the innovation. The Papacy, in the shape which it now wears, is only defensible on the plea that the original laws of the Christian kingdom are subject to development—or rather transformation—according to the presumed needs of successive ages. Gallicanism is a perpetual appeal to those same laws *before* the evolutionary process commenced. In other words, it is an appeal to the judgment and practice of the primitive Church. But there are those who would fain identify it with a system by which, in comparatively recent times, the Church was robbed of her dearest prerogatives; by which the free election of her bishops was abrogated, the voice of her Legislative Councils silenced, her judicial and disciplinary authority annulled. This was neither genuine Gallicanism nor genuine Christianity. According to Gallican theology, it is no less, but rather far more, repugnant to the spirit of the Gospel that the Church should be subjected, within the sphere of her divinely-ordained functions, to the arbitrary dictation of kings and parliaments, than that she should be ruled by the irresponsible will of her chief Bishop. The Church's "liberty" has always consisted, and must for ever consist, in being governed by her own canonical legislation; in the equitable administration of that sacred code by the Episcopate; and in its being frankly recognized and effectually protected by the civil power.

Once more, then, the reader is warned against the stratagem, now so commonly practised, of representing Gallicanism as a mere modern expedient for converting the Church into a hireling and a bondsman to the State. It is true that, under the pseudonym of Gallicanism, the ancient independence of the Church in its relations to the State was practically subverted; but Gallicanism is not answerable for this monstrous perversion of its principles. "Look on this picture and on that." Compare the portrait drawn by Pierre Pithou at the close of the sixteenth century with the cherished ideal of such men as Hincmar of Reims, Ivo of Chartres, Agobard of Lyons, and Bernard of Clairvaux. The one is a caricature of the other. The great

mediæval doctors rest their cause on principles which date from the very foundation of the "City of God," and which are therefore opposed alike to Papal and to secular Cæsarism. The modern programme is virtually an abnegation of the most important of those principles, forced upon the Church by the unscrupulous aggressions of the State.

The gradual metamorphosis of the Gallicanism of the primitive type into the hybrid system which latterly usurped its name—and which was not far removed from sheer Erastianism—is to be traced amid the vicissitudes of many centuries. Some account of it will be attempted in the course of the present work. The author does not pretend, however, to furnish a complete explanation of a series of transactions which, in many instances, were carefully masked under a veil of plausible deception, and which have been involved in further obscurity by conflicting historical testimony. There are problems connected with the fortunes of the Church in France which probably will never be solved with absolute certainty so long as the world lasts.

III.

The Church of France was distinguished for many ages by its zeal for the independence and purity of ecclesiastical *elections*. Under the first and second Frankish dynasties the Church was the main source and principle of civilization—the dominant power of society. All important acts of legislation emanated from its Councils. Its prelates were Ministers of State; its priests were civil magistrates; justice was ordinarily dispensed through its tribunals. Church and State were in fact so intimately blended, as to be scarcely distinguishable the one from the other. During this period, the right of the Church to freedom of action in the choice of its chief pastors was fully admitted in theory; and elections to the episcopate were made, according to primitive usage, by the suffrages of the clergy and faithful laity of the diocese; subject always to the regulations of the canons, and to the approval of the sovereign. It is true that this practice was often interfered with, especially under the later Merovingian princes; but such cases were exceptions and abuses. Freedom of election was the universally acknowledged *rule*, and was more or less exactly followed until after the fall of the Carlovingian Empire.

Thus, for example, the First Council of Auvergne,* A.D. 535, expressly condemns any attempt to attain the episcopal dignity through the favour and patronage of princes, rather than by personal merit and the universal suffrage of the faithful. The Fifth Council of Orleans, in 549, decrees that bishops shall be chosen, with the consent of the king, by the votes of the clergy and people, as enjoined by the ancient canons; and thereupon consecrated by the Metropolitan and his comprovincials. "Let it not be lawful for any one to obtain the episcopate by means of bribery or simoniacal contract. Let no man be appointed bishop over an unwilling flock; nor let any pressure be exercised by persons in authority, to procure the consent either of citizens or of clergy,—a thing shameful to speak of. If any such case should occur, let the bishop who has thus been ordained through violence, rather than by legitimate decree, be for ever deposed from the pontifical dignity."† The Fifth Synod of Paris, A.D. 557, enacts in its eighth canon, that the election of bishops shall be conducted freely by the clergy and people; that no one shall be intruded into a see by the command of the sovereign, or without the consent of the Metropolitan and comprovincials; that if any one shall venture to assume the episcopal dignity in virtue of a royal nomination, he shall not be recognized as bishop by the prelates of the province.‡ Again, it was declared by the great National Synod held at Paris in 615, under Clothaire II., that episcopal elections made without consent of the Metropolitan, the comprovincials, the clergy and laity of the diocese, as also those obtained through violence, intrigue, or simony, are absolutely null and void. The king, by an edict, confirmed this

* *Concil. Arvernense I.*, apud Sirm., *Conc. Antiq. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 242. See also *Concil. Aurelian. III.*, A.D. 538, Canon 3: "Ipse Metropolitanus à comprovincialibus episcopis, sicut decreta Sedis Apostolicæ continent, cum consensu cleri vel civium, eligatur; quia æquum est, sicut ipsa sedes Apostolica dixit, ut qui præponendus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur. De comprovincialibus verò ordinandis, cum consensu Metropolitanis, cleri, et civium, juxta priorum canonum statuta, electio et voluntas requiratur." It was S. Leo, in one of his epistles to the bishops of

the province of Vienne, who pronounced the celebrated dictum here referred to. "Per pacem et quietem Sacerdotes qui præfaturi sunt postulentur. Teneatur subscriptio clericorum, honoratorum testimonium, ordinis consensus, et plebis. Qui præfaturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur."

† *Concil. Arel. V.*, Canon X. Sirmond., *Conc. Antiq. Gall.*, tom. i.

‡ Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. v. p. 814. "Si absque electione Metropolitanis, cleri consensu, vel civium, fuerit in ecclesiâ intromissus, ordinatio ipsius, secundum Patrum statuta, irrita habeatur."

canon; adding, however, a clause to the effect that the crown was to authorise the act of consecration.*

The same rule prevailed under the Carlovingian dynasty. It was frequently infringed, indeed, by Charlemagne, who, in virtue of the quasi-ecclesiastical character which he assumed under the express sanction of the Holy See,† exercised supreme control over the whole external administration of the Church. But the *right* of canonical election is explicitly affirmed by this monarch in a capitulary of the year 803. "Being not ignorant of the sacred canons, in order that in the name of God Holy Church may the more freely enjoy her just privileges, we have signified our consent to the ecclesiastical order, that bishops shall be elected by the choice of the clergy and people, according to the canons, from the diocese where the vacancy occurs, without respect of persons or gift of presents, on the sole ground of meritorious life and pre-eminent wisdom."‡ This capitulary was republished verbatim by Louis le Debonnaire soon after his accession.§ In process of time it became customary to solicit from the crown permission to proceed to an election; and an officer, called the Visitor, usually one of the bishops of the province, was appointed to preside over the proceedings, and make a report on the event to the Metropolitan; the latter, in his turn, giving information to the king. If the Visitor reported that the election had been misconducted—that there had been bribery, simony, violence, or the like—the nomination became void, and the patronage, for that time, devolved upon the crown.||

The way was thus opened for a further extension of the royal prerogative with respect to the disposal of the highest ecclesiastical dignities. It appears that, under the later Carlovingians, the practice of applying to the crown for license to elect led to that of royal recommendations of the individual to be elected. Persons in office about the court, the relatives of the nobility, of

* "Si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinationem Principis ordinetur."—Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. v. p. 1649. Cf. Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II., Lib. ii., cap. 13.

† Charlemagne often describes himself in his *Capitularies* as "devotus sanctæ Ecclesiæ defensor, atque adjutor in omnibus Apostolicæ sedis."

‡ Baluz., *Capit. Reg. Franc.*, tom. i. p. 379. This capitulary is inserted in the *Decretum* of Gratian, Dist. lxiii. cap. 34, Sacrorum.

§ A.D. 816. Sirmond, *Conc. Antiq. Gallicæ*, tom. ii. p. 429.

|| Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii. cap. 21, § 9.

military chiefs, and other powerful retainers, naturally obtained the preference; and it required more courage than the electors possessed to reject candidates so protected, however slenderly they might be furnished with personal qualifications. Abuses thus arose, which were exposed and resisted with undaunted resolution by the famous Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims. On one occasion that prelate remonstrated in the plainest language with Louis III., in whose name an unworthy pastor had been intruded into the episcopate; bidding him not to imagine that when permission was requested from the sovereign to proceed to an election, it followed that the bishops, clergy, and people were bound to fix upon the person whom he had thought fit to nominate. "This," said the archbishop, "would be no election according to the terms of the Divine law, but a lawless usurpation of human power.* And if the circumstances be such as I have heard, without doubt the same malignant spirit who, in the guise of a serpent, deceived our first parents and caused the loss of paradise, has by means of similar flatterers whispered these delusions in your ear."†

The development of Feudalism brought with it important innovations affecting the hierarchy of the Church. Bishops, abbots, and all the higher dignitaries, became, in respect of their large landed possessions, feudatories to the crown and other secular suzerains; and as such, liable to the charges imposed on territorial property by feudal law. Certain prelates, holding estates in the "domaine royal," were invested with temporal peerages. The Archbishop of Reims, the bishops of Laon and Langres, were created dukes; the bishops of Beauvais, Noyon, Chalons sur Marne, obtained the title of count. The Bishop of Senlis, also, was at one period a peer of France. Next in order came the prelates who held fiefs of the dukes of Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, or of the counts of Champagne, Flanders, and Toulouse; these, in feudal language, were "arrière-vassaux" of the crown. Lower in the scale were the abbots—regular, secular, and commendatory—most of whom enjoyed feudal baronies.

The six great ecclesiastical peers took precedence of all other

* "Quæ non est Divinæ legis electio, sed humanæ potestatis extorsio."

† Hincmar, Epist. xix. (Migne, *Pa-*

trolog., tom. cxxvi. p. 111.) Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii., c. 23, § 3.

prelates, and of all lay peers except the princes of the blood royal. They possessed seats and votes in the Parliament of Paris, since that court was held to represent the ancient court of Peers, originally the supreme tribunal of the monarchy. The abbots of Cluny and of St. Denis "en France" were also members *ex officio* of the Parliament of Paris.*

All these clerical potentates were entitled to exercise the rights of sovereignty within the limits of their own territories; to coin money, impose taxes, make laws, declare war and peace, and administer justice by their local courts and officers. Considering the vast extent of their civil and political powers, it was essential to discover some expedient by which they might be kept in due subordination and allegiance to the crown. For this purpose advantage was taken of the feudal ceremony of investiture. The oath of homage was exacted from the holders of spiritual fiefs, as from all other vassals; and when the new prelate had thus pledged his fealty to his suzerain, the latter granted to him the *investiture* of his fief, by delivering to him the crozier and the ring. These, however, were the appropriate ensigns, not of temporal dignity, but of the pastoral office. It was a plausible proceeding in appearance, but in reality it carried with it a most dangerous invasion of the liberties, and even of the constitution, of the Church. For it implied, in the first place, that the nomination to the highest ecclesiastical dignities formed part of the inherent prerogative of the crown; and the right of free election by the clergy and people was thus ignored. But further, it suggested the idea that investiture conferred, not only the episcopal status in the feudal hierarchy, but also the episcopal *office*; *i. e.* that lay hands conveyed a purely spiritual jurisdiction. It was from the prevalence of such grave misconceptions that the celebrated contest arose in the eleventh century, known as the "War of Investitures."

During this great struggle (the course of which was far less violent, however, in France than elsewhere) the Gallican Church vindicated its rights with courage, and on the whole with success. Gallican divines seem to have admitted that the sovereign was entitled to confer on bishops the investiture of their temporal fiefs held of the crown, provided that the ecclesiastical election

* Cf. Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, III. Lib. i. capp. 30, 31.

and consecration had taken place *previously*; and provided, also, that the oath exacted was that of "homage simple," not of "homage lige." These conditions, it was held, sufficiently excluded the notion that lay investiture had any share in the transmission of the spiritual powers of the episcopate. Such was the view taken by the great canonist Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, as appears from his correspondence with the Papal Legate Hugues, Archbishop of Lyons;* and again, by Hugues de Fleury, in his treatise "*De regiâ potestate et sacerdotali dignitate.*"†

The practice, thus guarded and limited, became eventually prevalent in France. The Bishop was first canonically elected; the election was then published, and confirmed by the Metropolitan;‡ then followed the consecration; and lastly, the new prelate took the oath of allegiance to the sovereign, upon which he was put into possession of the temporalities of his see. This order was indeed violated in later times as to one most important particular. When the Crown had succeeded in monopolizing the patronage of the higher Church dignities, the oath of homage was commonly made to precede, instead of following, the act of consecration;—an abuse against which the French clergy did not fail to protest on various occasions.§

In the course of this agitating controversy, the cause of ecclesiastical independence was resolutely defended by several great Councils held in France:—at Clermont, in 1095, in the

* Ivon., *Episc. Carnot.*, Epist. lx. (ap. Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. 162, p. 72. Cf. Thomassin, *Fel. et Noc. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii. cap. 32.

† "Rex instinctu Spiritus sancti potest, sicut existimo, presulatus honorem religioso clerico tribuere; animarum vero curam Archiepiscopus debet ei committere. Post electionem autem, non annulum aut baculum a manu regiâ, sed investituram rerum sæcularium electus antistes debet suscipere, et in suis ordinibus per annulum aut baculum animarum curam ab archiepiscopo suo, ut negotium huiusmodi sine disceptatione peragatur, et terrenis et spiritualibus potestatibus suæ auctoritatis privilegium conservetur. Quod si regulariter fuerit conservatum, implebitur illud quod Salvator noster in evangelio præ-

cipiens dicit, "*Reddite quæ sunt Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei Deo.*" Hugon. Floriac., *Tractatus de regiâ potestate et sacerdotali dignitate*, apud Baluz., *Miscellaneæ*, tom. ii. p. 144.

‡ Thomassin, *Fel. et Noc. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii. cap. 15. Metropolitanæ were confirmed by the Provincial Council, *Ib.* cap. 19, No. 9, 12. But from the time of Charlemagne the custom began to prevail of seeking confirmation from the Pope; an abuse which arose, like many others, from disputes which could not be settled without reference to Rome, and from laxity and negligence on the part of the local episcopate.

§ See the official collection entitled *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. xi. p. 1083 et seqq.

presence of Pope Urban II.; at Troyes, in 1107, under Pope Paschal II. in person; at Vienne, in Dauphiné, in 1112, where the bishops repudiated the pusillanimous concessions of Paschal to the Emperor Henry V.;* and at Reims, in 1119, where Pope Calixtus II., at the head of thirteen archbishops and more than two hundred bishops, prohibited all investitures at the hands of laymen. This last imposing exhibition contributed probably to bring about the compromise called the "Concordat of Worms," which shortly afterwards terminated the strife.

Towards the close of the twelfth century, the system of ecclesiastical elections underwent a still further modification. From the time when the election of the sovereign Pontiff was restricted to the College of Cardinals, the Cathedral Chapters laid claim to the exercise of a corresponding privilege in the choice of their diocesans, to the exclusion not only of the laity, but of the parochial clergy.† This assumption was ratified in express terms by the 24th Canon of the great Lateran Council, in 1215;‡ and the right was generally recognized thenceforward as belonging to the capitular bodies. The elections were made by three different forms of procedure—by "inspiration," by "compromise," or by "scrutiny;"—terms borrowed from those in use in the Roman conclave. The choice of the Chapter was then confirmed by the Metropolitan, with an appeal, in case of dispute, to the Pope.§ This practice continued during the greater part of three centuries; but it was subject to frequent interruptions, and was attended with serious evils. On the one hand, gross unblushing simony was induced by the perpetual intervention of the Crown in favour of its own candidates; while on the other, appeals to Rome became so common, on the ground of alleged informality or defect in the elections, that the patronage in numberless instances passed into the hands of the Pope. By means of "devolutions," "reserves," "apostolical mandates,"

* De Marca, *Concord.*, Lib. iv. cap. 8, § 7. It was on this occasion that the Gallican prelates, demanding from Pope Paschal the confirmation of their conciliar decision, made the celebrated declaration, "Si, quod minime credimus, nostræ paternitatis assertiones roborare nolueritis, propitius sit nobis Deus, quia nos à vestrà obedientiâ

repelletis."—Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. x. p. 785.

† De Marca, *Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, Lib. viii. cap. 2, § 9.

‡ *Concil. Lateran. IV.*, Can. XXIV., Quia propter. Extrav. de Electione.

§ Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii. cap. 33.

“expective graces,”* and other specious expedients, the Court of Rome gradually acquired a predominant influence in the disposal of all the higher preferments in France.†

The first attempt of any importance to apply a remedy to these anomalies was made by St. Louis; who, in the year 1268, promulgated his famous Ordonnance called the Pragmatic Sanction.‡ That monarch, though a devoted son of the Church, full of affectionate veneration for the Holy See, did not hesitate to insert in this remarkable statute provisions aimed directly against notorious evils which had arisen from Papal usurpation; and claimed both for Church and State in France a certain character of independent nationality. The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis has been styled “the foundation stone of the Gallican liberties.”§ It is comprised in six articles. The *first* declares that the prelates, patrons, and ordinary collators to benefices in the kingdom shall fully enjoy their rights, and that the jurisdiction lawfully belonging to each shall be maintained. The *second* guarantees to cathedral churches the right of free episcopal election. The *third* directs that the “pestilential crime of simony” be altogether banished (*penitus eliminandum*) from the kingdom. The *fourth* ordains that ecclesiastical promotions and appointments of whatever kind be made conformably to the common law, the canons of Councils, and the ancient institutions of the Fathers.|| The *fifth* prohibits the heavy pecuniary burdens imposed by the Roman Court upon the Church of France, “whereby our kingdom has been lamentably impoverished;” and provides “that none shall be hereafter levied, unless for a reasonable, pious, urgent, and indispensable necessity, and with the free consent of the king and the said

* “Devolution” signifies the lapse of a benefice to the Pope, by reason of failure on the part of the patron to present a clerk duly qualified. By “reserves” the Pope appropriated to himself certain nominations, either in particular cases, for a particular period, or in particular countries. An “Apostolical mandate” was a brief addressed to a Cathedral chapter, directing that a vacant canonry or other dignity should be bestowed on the person therein named. “Graces expectatives” (*gratiæ expectativæ*) were prospective pre-

sentations to benefices not yet vacant.

† Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. discip.*, II. Lib. ii. cap. 31, § 9.

‡ *Ordonnances des Rois*, tom. i. p. 97. The authenticity of this edict has been contested; but it is clearly established by Edm. Richer, *Hist. Conc. Gen.*, Lib. ii. p. 189.

§ Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, tom. iii. c. 22.

|| Such, in the judgment of S. Louis and his advisers, was the true foundation of ecclesiastical “liberty.”

Church of France." By the *sixth* and last article, the king "renews, approves, and confirms all the franchises, prerogatives, rights, and privileges granted by himself and his predecessors to the churches, monasteries, religious orders, and ecclesiastics of the realm."

But the legislation of St. Louis—honourable as it was to his own motives and character—produced little or no permanent effect. Unworthy intrigue, simoniacal corruption, bitter dissension, even tumultuous violence, became matters of common scandal in the capitular elections. The interference of Rome was perpetually invoked in contested cases; and it was this that led by degrees to the practice of *reserving* to the Pope the presentation to certain benefices, and to various other methods of alienating preferment from the lawful patrons. Pontiffs of the stamp of Boniface VIII. and John XXII. usurped as a right what their predecessors had resorted to only under circumstances of exceptional urgency, for the purpose of redressing abuses which were bringing the Church into disgrace and contempt.

IV.

A second principle affirmed with marked emphasis from time to time by the Gallican Church was that of the independence of its local Councils, and the free exercise of canonical Jurisdiction by its Metropolitans. In no part of the Christian world have Councils been more frequent than in the Church of France; a circumstance highly favourable, at first sight, to its disciplinary condition, inasmuch as it is by Councils that the Church speaks, acts, and judges, in its corporate capacity. But it will be found on examination that their character and mode of action varied materially from age to age; and that their history, as a whole, presents a faithful epitome of the fluctuating fortunes of the Church, in its relations to the Roman supremacy on one side, and to the domination of the civil authority on the other. In early times, while complete harmony and union prevailed between Church and State, Gallican synods were energetic, vigilant, and influential. But to this palmy period succeeded one of lamentable laxity, which continued till the ignominious downfall of the first Frankish dynasty. Under the "rois fainéants" synods were gradually disused, and the functions of Metropolitans became

almost extinct. A brief resuscitation followed under the Carolingians; but at a later date, when their empire began to sink into decay, the legislative system of the Church was fatally attacked by the innovating policy of Rome, which reduced Councils into dependence on the arbitrary will of the Pope, and sapped their authority through the abuse of the privilege of appeals. At length the spirit of mediævalism was compelled to yield to the steadily-sustained aggression of the French monarchs of the "third race;" and in the sixteenth century Gallican synods underwent a change of organization so essential, that, although the clergy were still permitted to assemble by representation, their meetings lost their original designation, which indeed would have been a misnomer under such circumstances. The Pope had enslaved the Councils of the Church; the Crown suppressed them.

Diocesan Synods—consisting of the clergy of a single diocese under the presidency of the bishop—were held originally twice in the year, in spring and autumn; in later times only once a year. Provincial Synods, consisting of the Metropolitan and Comprovincial bishops, together with some few clergy of the second order selected by them,* were in like manner celebrated in the early ages twice every year, as ordered by the canon of Nicæa; apparently without interference on the part of the secular Government, either in convoking or confirming them. The Provincial Council, according to the invariable Gallican tradition, was the ordinary tribunal for the decision of all ecclesiastical causes; it was the court of appeal from Diocesan synods, and appeal from it was allowed, in certain cases and under well-defined restrictions, to the Roman See. Yet in process of time, through the same conflicting influences which proved successful in annulling the freedom of elections, this great and wise institution of antiquity fell into disuse in France. The clergy urgently and constantly petitioned for its restoration, and sometimes with partial success; but it was never permanently re-established.

A third form of ecclesiastical assembly obtained from a very

* It would seem, however, that presbyters were present only as the substitutes of bishops who were unable to attend. Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.*, II. Lib. iii. capp. 50, 52 53.

The Second Council of Orleans, A.D. 533, ordered Provincial Councils to be held once a year. Sirmond., *Conc. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. 229.

early period, namely that of the National Synod. These were originally meetings of the bishops of the seventeen provinces which formed the political "Diocese of Gaul." Hence they are alluded to in the Theodosian Code as "Diocesan Synods."* "A Diocesan Synod," says the commentator Godefroï, "is composed of prelates belonging to several provinces, gathered together under the presidency of a patriarch, primate, or exarch. These Councils," he continues, "are called Universal. Such were those of Africa, of *Gaul*, of Spain, of Britain, and the like." From the middle of the fourth century the Gallican episcopate was accustomed thus to meet in synod for the dispatch of ecclesiastical affairs, under the direct sanction and summons of the Imperial Government. Such were the Synod of Arles in 353; of Beziers two years afterwards; of Paris in 362; of Valence in 374; of Bordeaux in 385; of Treves in 386.† An Imperial rescript was addressed to the Patriarch, Primate, or Metropolitan, who thereupon cited the prelates within his jurisdiction to attend at a given time and place.‡ But these larger gatherings by no means superseded or obstructed the celebration of Diocesan and Provincial Councils. On the contrary, they enforced them as essential to sound discipline, and enjoined them on the bishops under severe penalties.§

During the decline of the Empire, the power of convoking these national Councils was claimed by the Metropolitan Bishops of Arles, to which city the seat of civil government had been transferred on the destruction of Treves by the Vandals. The ambitious Hilary insisted upon this, among other prerogatives, as belonging to his See, and induced the Second Council of Arles to pass a canon to that effect. || Pope Hilarius, in 462, expressly conferred the right of summoning Councils on Leontius, Bishop of Arles; Pope Symmachus made a similar decree in favour of St. Cæsarius; and again, Pope Vigilius in favour of St. Aurelian. But the Barbarian conquerors, in proportion as they made good

* *Cod. Theod.*, Lib. xvi. Tit. ii. § 23. Ed. Ritter.

† Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.*, II. Lib. iii. capp. 45, 49.

‡ De Marca, *De Conc.*, Lib. vi. cap. 17, § 4; cap. 19, § 3.

§ Thomassin, *ubi supra*.

|| *Conc. Arelat. II.*, Can. xviii. : "Ad

Arelatensis Episcopi arbitrium Synodus congreganda; ad quam urbem ex omnibus mundi partibus, præcipuè Gallicanis, sub sancti Marini tempore legimus celebratum fuisse concilium atque conventum." — Sirmond, *Conc. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 105.

their footing in Gaul, assumed the same authority in ecclesiastical concerns that had been exercised by their predecessors; and ere long it was made necessary to the holding of a National Council that their consent should be first obtained. Thus the great Council of Agde (Agathense) in 506, at which St. Cæsarius presided, was celebrated "by permission of Alaric king of the Visigoths." Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, held the Council of Epaone under the authority of Sigismund king of the Burgundians. The first Council of Orleans (A.D. 511) assembled by order of Clovis,* and presented its canons to that prince, with a request that he would confirm and publish them in his quality of sovereign. The second Council of Orleans states in like manner, in the preface to its Canons, that it was convened "by command of the most glorious sovereigns"—*i. e.* of Theodoric, Childebert, and Clothaire, the sons of Clovis. Sigebert, King of Austrasia, in a letter to Desiderius, Bishop of Chalons, reproves the bishops for having met in synod without the previous sanction of the Crown; and intimates that such proceedings must not be repeated. "Though desirous to respect the Canons and Constitutions ecclesiastical, he had determined, with the concurrence of his nobles, that no Synod should be held in his dominions without his knowledge. If his permission were requested, and sufficient cause assigned, it would not be refused." †

The records of Councils during the fifth and sixth centuries, and the early part of the seventh, give ample testimony to the zeal of the Gallican Episcopate both for exactness of discipline and purity of doctrine. The liberties of the Church were, however, grievously invaded by the later Merovingian princes; they violated the freedom of elections, set at nought the decrees of Councils, practised simony, and encouraged abuses which, unless corrected, would have been fatal to the ecclesiastical constitution.

So long as the laws of the Church were outwardly respected, and ecclesiastical authority was substantially upheld by the civil ruler, it would seem that the Popes of this period forbore to meddle with the practice of National Churches as to synods and other details of discipline. But when the sceptre had

* "Auctore Deo et ex evocatione gloriosissimi regis Chlotovechi."

† Baluz., *Capit. Reg. Franc.*, tom. i.

p. 143. *Preuves des Libertés de l'Egl. Gallic.*, p. 234.

fallen into the degenerate hands of the last descendants of Clovis, they failed not to interpose with the vigour and fearlessness which befitted their office.

Thus Gregory the Great, hearing that synods were systematically neglected in Austrasia, wrote in strong language to Queen Brunehilde, exhorting her to lose no time in calling a General Assembly of the prelates of the realm. Failing of success, the Pontiff despatched letters to the Metropolitans of Arles, Lyons, Vienne, and the Bishop of Autun,* bidding them employ all their influence at court to procure the required Council. Subsequently he appointed Virgilius, Bishop of Arles, his Vicar-General throughout the empire of the Franks,† (with an express reservation, however, of the rights of Metropolitans) and authorized him to convoke bishops in Council for the adjudication of ecclesiastical causes; enjoining an appeal, in cases of special difficulty, to the Apostolic See.‡

It will scarcely be denied, on a candid consideration of the circumstances, that such action was originally taken by the Popes out of zeal for the efficient administration of the Church. Contemporary evidence shows that the intervention of Rome was occasioned by the incapacity and unfaithfulness both of the civil authorities and of the local episcopate. It is true that this movement resulted eventually in a wider development of the power of the Papacy, both spiritual and temporal; but that result cannot be ascribed with justice to a mere sordid love of self-aggrandisement, or a systematic pursuit of power for its own sake.

In spite of all efforts and remonstrances, few Councils were held in Gaul during the latter part of the Merovingian period. Only twenty are recorded during the whole of the seventh century; and through this culpable laxity on the part of its responsible rulers, the Gallo-Frankish Church sank into a deplorable state of corruption and decay.§

* This was Syagrius, a prelate who stood high in the confidence of Brunehilde. Gregory, at her request, sent him the pallium, and gave him precedence in the province next to the Metropolitan of Lyons.

† Virgilius seems to have been the last bishop of Arles who exercised the office of Apostolic Vicar in Gaul. The

disorders of the times extinguished not only the primatial jurisdiction of that See, but almost the entire system of episcopal government.

‡ S. Greg., *Registr. Epist.*, Lib. v., Ep. 53, 54, 55; Lib. ix. Ep. 106; Lib. xi. Ep. 63. Edit. Benedict., Paris, 1705.

§ The following picture of its con-

The accession of the Carolingian dynasty brought with it a remarkable revival of discipline. The "second race" of Frank sovereigns formed an intimate alliance with the Roman Pontiffs; and the latter, perceiving that their acquisition of power might prove of infinite service to the Church, supported them with the whole weight of their authority, and invested them, in fact, with functions which were purely ecclesiastical. Carloman, the son and successor of Charles Martel, commenced the work of reformation by convening a National Council, known as that "of Germany," in the year 742.* The great S. Boniface, archbishop of Mayence, presided on this occasion, under a special commission as Legate from Pope Zacharias.† The canons then enacted were republished in the following year at another Council held at Leptines, also under the presidency of S. Boniface. The same course was pursued by Pepin-le-Bref; in whose reign the Council of Verna‡ enjoined that two Assemblies should be held every year; the first in the month of March, in the presence of the king, and at the place which he should appoint; the second in October, at Soissons or elsewhere, as the bishops might determine when they met in the spring. The first of these was a mixed assembly, consisting not of bishops only, but also of the counts and other lay nobles;§ the latter was an ecclesiastical synod, composed of metropolitans, bishops, abbots, and priests. It was convoked by the metropolitans, and all persons summoned by them were canonically bound to attend.

The government of Charlemagne presented a singular specimen of the complete fusion or amalgamation of Church and State. The national assemblies of his reign were virtually, though not in strict form, Councils of the Church; while, on the other hand, the bishops, in their quality of "Missi dominici," were employed as actively in the concerns of political government as in the

dition is drawn by S. Boniface in a letter to Pope Zacharias:—"Franci, ut seniores dicunt, plusquam per tempus octoginta annorum synodum non fecerunt, nec Archiepiscopum habuerunt, nec Ecclesiæ canonica jura alicubi fundabant vel renovabant. Modò autem maximâ ex parte per civitates Episcopales sedes traditæ sunt laicis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, sæculariter ad

perfrueudum."

* "Concilium Germanicum." The locality is doubtful; it is conjectured to have been Ratisbon.—Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. vi. p. 1533.

† Baron., *Annal.*, tom. xii. p. 477.

‡ "Concilium Vernense," A.D. 755.

§ We have here the evident germ of the modern "Parlement," which was originally of a semi-ecclesiastical character.

spiritual administration of their dioceses. It must be observed, however, that during the life of Charlemagne these assemblies had little or no direct authority in legislation, whether political or ecclesiastical. They were scarcely more than consultative bodies; the Emperor retained in his own hands the initiative of measures to be discussed, and also the power of final decision. The See of Rome expressly sanctioned, instead of opposing, this course of action; and it must be acknowledged that the interests of the Church could hardly have been confided to worthier hands than those of Charlemagne. His zeal for the exact observance of synodal legislation was unbounded. His 'Capitularies' are full of passages quoted from the ancient councils, such as those of Nicæa, Chalcedon, Antioch, Ancyra, Sardica, Gangra, Carthage, and Neocæsarea—which he applies and enforces as laws of the Empire. The clergy of all ranks trusted him implicitly, and had abundant cause for doing so. They regarded the Imperial decrees with scarcely less reverence and submission than they paid to the canonical legislation of the Church. They styled them "the handmaids of the canons;"* and were accustomed to transcribe and adopt them *verbatim* in the proceedings of Provincial and Diocesan Synods.† Hence we find frequent extracts from them in the collection of Canon Law by Ivo of Chartres, and in the 'Decretum' of Gratian.

In the last year but one of his reign Charlemagne convoked five great Councils simultaneously in the metropolitical cities of Arles, Mayence, Reims, Tours, and Chalons. They legislated in a spirit of unqualified subjection to the Crown; they submitted their canons in distinct terms to the judgment of the Emperor, requesting him to alter and correct whatever he might disapprove, and to confirm and give effect to whatever he might think wise and profitable.‡

But the system of government pursued by Charlemagne was exceptional and transient. When the Empire, under the rule of his incapable successors, was manifestly falling into decrepitude and dissolution, the Popes began a second time to interfere with decisive energy in the internal administration of the Gallican

* "Ut canonum præcipiunt instituta, simulque eorum pedisequa Regum capitularia."—*Concil. Troslei.*, Can. III.

† Cf. Baluz., *Capit.*, Præfat. ad Lect.

‡ Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. vii. p. 1238 et seq. Dupuy, *Preuves des Libertés*, &c., p. 238.

Church. They now asserted an absolute right to receive appeals in all ecclesiastical causes, and that even previously to the sentence of the local tribunals. They claimed the power of convoking Councils at their pleasure—of presiding over them either in person or by “legates à latere”—of confirming or disallowing their decisions, and even of annulling them altogether. These pretensions were not wholly new; for, as we have already seen, the principle of appealing to Rome in the “*causæ majores*” was recognized at least as early as the fifth century. Leo the Great had censured and disallowed the legislation even of an Œcumenical Council; and the proceedings of Provincial synods had been revised and reversed in various instances of an equally remote date. But this system was now more extensively developed and more stringently applied; and the circumstances of the Church, both external and internal, were such as to promote its reception. Secular government—no longer directed by the master-mind of Charlemagne—was sinking into a state of collapse, and society was threatened with anarchy and chaos. The Crown was powerless to protect the Church; while the great lay vassals, struggling among themselves for ascendancy, had every inducement to embarrass its action. The clergy, meanwhile, especially the bishops, possessed a considerable share of power, arising not only from their superiority in intellect and education, but from the vast extent of their domains, and the high rank which they held in the feudal aristocracy. The Popes, doubtless, perceived that this power, skilfully consolidated and efficiently administered, might prove the providential means of restoring unity and order, both social and religious. They saw that Rome, at such a moment, was the true rallying-point—the true source of moral regeneration. To rivet more closely the links which bound all orders of ecclesiastics to the See of Peter was to concentrate, and therefore immeasurably to increase, the energies and resources of the Church. This policy—often so severely reprobated as an inexcusable usurpation—does not appear to have sprung from any deliberate design either to intrude upon the just prerogatives of the Crown or to curtail the liberty of the Church, according to the sense in which it was then understood. The problem of the moment was how to save both Church and State by enabling them to make head against the surging flood of semi-barbarous revolution. It was

a necessity, at such a crisis, that the ecclesiastical element, as embodied in the Papacy, should assume grander and more dominant proportions, in order to avert a general cataclysm. Nor, perhaps, ought we to be surprised that the Popes, in the face of such difficulties, should have overstepped the bounds of precedent and ignored the legislation of former ages. For any such modification of existing usage a plausible excuse was always at hand in the abnormal circumstances of the times. "*Salus populi suprema lex.*"

The appellate jurisdiction of Rome—involving as it did questions of crucial importance as to the rights of metropolitans and the authority of provincial Councils—was the main-spring of the agitation which prevailed during the ninth and tenth centuries. The Gallican episcopate, under the leadership of Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, steadily defended the supremacy of the ancient Canon Law, which they maintained to be unalterably binding. The Pope, on the contrary, seems to have held that the legislation of primitive times might be made to square with considerations of expediency, and adapted to the successive needs of the Church. Hence arose a conflict between the old and the new discipline; the former based on the decrees of the great Œcumenical Councils—the latter derived chiefly from the rescripts of individual Pontiffs, or rather from a series of documents purporting to be such, but which are now known to be spurious—the "*Pseudo-Isidorian*" Decretals. Hincmar, the champion of the constitutional system, was not only an accurate canonist, but a man of remarkable administrative power, and the foremost statesman of the age. He was confronted, however, by one who was at least his equal in genius and energy, and who had formed a broader conception of the requirements of the Church at a moment of special embarrassment. This was Pope Nicholas I. The struggle which ensued was keen and lengthened; but the Papal policy triumphed in the end.

Several typical cases occurred at this period, illustrating the change of relation between the Papal See and the metropolitan and diocesan episcopate. The first is that of Rhotad, Bishop of Soissons. Here the conduct of Pope Nicholas was manifestly contrary to the existing statutes and long-established practice of the Church. Rhotad had been cited by his Metropolitan, Hincmar, to answer certain charges before a provincial Council

at Senlis. He refused to appear, and appealed to the Pope; which, according to the canons, he had no right to do until *after* the synod of the province had pronounced its sentence. Being summoned to attend a second Council at Soissons, he again declined; whereupon he was arrested by the King's order, deposed from office, and confined in a monastery. The Archbishop and his suffragan were both politically and personally obnoxious to each other; and there can be no doubt that the treatment experienced by Rhotad, even if justifiable by the letter of the law, was harsh and extreme. His appeal was eagerly received at Rome, and the Pope wrote to Hincmar requiring him to reinstate the accused prelate within thirty days, on pain of suspension; or, as an alternative, to send him forthwith to Rome, together with commissioners on his own behalf, that the case might be re-argued in the presence of the Pontiff.* But these were unconstitutional demands. Hincmar, in his reply, which is worded with the utmost respect, reminds the Pope of the forms of procedure with regard to appeals to Rome, as prescribed by the Council of Sardica, upon whose decrees the practice mainly rested. He states that, in the *causæ majores* affecting bishops, if the accused appeals to the Holy See, it is the duty of the provincial Synod, after pronouncing judgment, to report to the Pope; and that, if his Holiness should so determine, the cause must be heard a second time. The Pope, however, does not arbitrate in person—far less does he restore such accused prelate by virtue of his sole prerogative; but he issues a commission to the comprovincial bishops, or to other special legates, desiring them to institute a fresh trial on the spot; their decision being final.† Such, undoubtedly, were the regulations then in force; and hence we see that the Gallican Bishops still adhered to those wise provisions of antiquity, by which the Church had drawn a distinction between autocratical supremacy and a limited Patriarchal jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, since the Pope persisted in requiring the personal appearance of Rhotad at Rome, he was at length permitted to proceed thither. Nicholas, after waiting several months, but in vain, for the commissaries whom he had ordered Hincmar to

* Nicolai Papæ I., Epis. 34, ann. 863 (Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. cxix.)

† Sirmond, *Concil. Antiq. Gall.*, tom. iii. p. 254.

send to represent him, proceeded to restore the deposed bishop in due form, and despatched a legate to France, by whom the sentence was carried into effect. Rhotad continued to govern the see of Soissons till his death.

All the circumstances connected with this case of Rhotad deserve careful examination. It appears that the Council which deposed him had submitted to the Pope that the Bishop's appeal was inadmissible according to the laws of the Empire. In reply to this, Nicholas gave them to understand that "temporal laws are not always to be applied to ecclesiastical causes, inasmuch as they are often at variance with the provisions of the canons."* Further, he instructs them that in causes of this nature the jurisdiction of the Pope is paramount; his sentence, the highest and irrefragable expression of the Church's judicial authority. "Even if Rhotad had not appealed, you ought not to have deposed a bishop without consulting the Pope, in violation of so many decretals and precepts of our predecessors, which the Roman Church reverently preserves among its archives." And whereas it was objected (in all probability by Hincmar) that these decretals were not to be found in the Code of Canons, and therefore were not obligatory, Nicholas declares that *all* injunctions of the Pope are of equal authority, equally binding on the faithful, whether included in the collection of canons or not.†

* Grat., *Decret.*, I. Dist. x. cap. 1. "Lege imperatorum non in omnibus ecclesiasticis controversiis utendum est, præsertim quum inveniantur evangelicæ et canonicæ sanctioni aliquoties obviare. Lex imperatorum non est supra legem Dei, sed subtus. Imperiali iudicio non possunt ecclesiastica jura dissolvi."

† Nicol. ad univ. Episc. Galliæ, ap. Sirmond, *Concil. Antiq. Gall.*, tom. iii. p. 259. The celebrated canon "Si Romanorum" (Dist. xix. cap. 1) is extracted from this epistle. Here the Pope quotes the authority of his predecessors, Leo and Gelasius, as decisive upon the point of discipline which was contested by the Gallican bishops. The former Pontiff had stated, in one of his Epistles, that "all decretal constitutions promulgated by the Holy See out of the ecclesiastical regulations and the directions of the canons, were to be observed in the Church with such

exactness, that any one wilfully offending against them must not expect to be excused." ("Omnia decretalia constituta, tam beatæ recordationis Innocentii, quàm omnium decessorum nostrorum, quæ de ecclesiasticis ordinibus et canonum promulgata sunt disciplinis, ita à vestrà Dilectione custodiri mandamus, ut si quis in illa commiserit, veniam sibi noverit denegari.") But Edm. Richer (*De eccles. et polit. potest. Demonstr.*, cap. 8. § 3) points out that this does not refer to decrees made by the Pope on his personal authority, "ex motu proprio," but to injunctions published by him *as extracted from the canons*,—the Pope being the organ through which the laws of Councils are announced to the universal Church. Indeed Gratian himself, commenting on the canon in question, qualifies the authority of these decretals by a similar restriction. "Hoc intelligendum est de illis sanctionibus vel

The obvious tendency of such a doctrine was to render the Pope independent of the legislation of Councils, and, in fact, to supersede the legislative functions of the Church altogether.

It appears, then (1), that the practice of referring *causæ majores*, such as the deposition of a bishop, to the judgment of Rome in the first instance, was unsanctioned by the Code of Canons (that of Dionysius Exiguus) at this time received in the Gallican Church. And (2), that the practice was said to be justified by certain decretal epistles of ancient Pontiffs, which, nevertheless, had not been inserted in the authorized body of Canon law. Baronius and most historians infer that the decretals thus alluded to are none other than the documents which had then recently made their appearance under the name of "Isidore Mercator," and which long afterwards were discovered to be forgeries. There is no reason to suppose, however, that Nicholas was aware that they were forged; indeed, since he never quotes from the Isidorian collection, and since it was first circulated in a part of Europe far distant from Rome, it is probable that he had never seen it.* On the other hand, supposing these documents to be genuine, they would, of course, have possessed considerable weight and authority towards determining the points in debate. Presumably, in the absence of proof to the contrary, they were genuine; and accordingly Hincmar, though he may have had his private suspicions, did not object to them publicly on the score of authenticity, but because, in the first place, these epistles were sometimes inconsistent with themselves, and next, because in some cases they were at variance with the ancient canon law.† The latter was the principal gravamen. It was a

decretalibus epistolis, in quibus nec præcedentium Patrum decretis, nec evangelicis præceptis, aliquid contrarium invenitur."

* See the ingenious arguments of Ballerini, *De Ant. Collect. Can.*, Pt. III. cap. 6, S. Leon., *Opp.* tom. iii.

† "In illis reperiri quasdam sententias inter se dissonas; potiusque esse sacris canonibus promulgatis fidem accommodandum, quam ejusmodi epistolis."—Flodoard., *Hist. Rhemens.*, Lib. iii. cap. 22.

"Quantum enim distet inter ea scilicet Concilia quæ custodienda et recipienda decrevit, et inconvulsa fir-

maque deinceps Patres Catholici manere voluerunt; et illas epistolas quæ diversis temporibus pro diversorum consolatione datæ fuerunt, quas venerabiliter suscipiendas docuit, nemo dogmatibus exercitatus ignorat. Si enim quædam ex his quæ in quibusdam illis epistolis continentur tenere et custodiri velle inceperimus, adversus ea quæ ante servare voluimus, faciemus; et à Conciliis sacris quæ perpetuò nobis recipienda, tenenda, custodienda atque sequenda sunt, deviabimus." Hincm. opusc. in caus. Hincm. Laudun., cap. 25 (Migne, *Patrol.*, tom. cxxvi.). This latter passage is decisive as to Hinc-

question of comparative and relative authority. There might exist, not improbably, whether at Rome or elsewhere, decretal epistles of the early Popes, in addition to those which had been collected by Dionysius, and embodied in his *Codex Canonum*. Any and all such utterances of the Apostolic See, if agreeable to the legislation of Œcumenical councils, Hincmar declared himself ready to accept with the utmost veneration. But he declined to invest these dicta of individual Pontiffs with an authority co-equal with that of the Church in her legislative synods. It was this latter portentous assumption of the Papacy that formed the strain of the contest so gallantly sustained by Hincmar and his suffragans, and by several successive generations of the Gallican hierarchy. The controversy, in the ninth and tenth centuries, did not turn upon the genuineness of the particular collection of decretals edited by the Pseudo-Isidore (for it would seem that in those days there was not sufficient critical skill to detect the fraud) but upon the degree of ecclesiastical force and obligation attaching to *any* documents of that nature, when put in competition with the synodical statutes of the Church.

Pope Nicholas showed a similar spirit of encroachment in the matter of certain priests who were deposed by a provincial council at Soissons in the year 853, as having been uncanonically ordained by Ebbo, a former Archbishop of Reims, who had himself been deprived for taking part in the treasonable conspiracy against Louis le Debonnaire. They appealed to the Apostolic See; and the Pope—although there was no just ground of exception to the proceedings at Soissons, which had been confirmed

mar's view of the general drift of the Isidorian decretals—*viz.*, that they tended to introduce a serious *change of discipline*, a departure from the venerable legislation of the ancient Councils. Even Ballerini admits that some such result followed from the publication and reception of the spurious canons. "*Negari non posse videtur, quin eadem (nova) disciplina latius propagata magis multo inoleverit, postquam eadem decretales editæ et divulgatæ fuerunt, ac mox in quibusdam Conciliis laudatæ.*" The change is thus characterised by the Chancellor D'Aguesseau:—"The old law signifies

the ancient collections of canons which were current in the Church till the publication of Isidore's collection exclusively. The new law consists of the new collections of canons and Pontifical decretals, the last of which forms, together with the *Decretum* of Gratian, what is called the 'Body of canon law.' This collection is chiefly composed of what is least valuable in the canonical constitutions, insomuch that it might be more correctly styled the body of the Pope's law than of the law of the Church."—D'Aguesseau, *Instructions sur les Études, Œuvres*, tom. i. p. 281.

by his predecessor—ordered the Bishops to meet a second time and revise their sentence. Hincmar behaved on this occasion with remarkable moderation and forbearance. He pointed out that it was impossible to cancel the decrees of the former synod, which had been passed by legitimate authority, and were fully justified by the facts; but at the same time he suggested that in virtue of the power conferred upon them by the Pope's commission, it was open to them to commute a sentence which his Holiness considered too severe, and to satisfy the requirements of discipline by the "more excellent way" of charity. Accordingly the Council, while carefully maintaining the validity of the previous acts in condemnation of the accused, restored them to the priesthood as a measure of "indulgence," and out of deference to the wishes of the Holy Father.*

Under Adrian II., who succeeded Nicholas, the Gallicans again contended for the lawful jurisdiction of their local Councils in the case of Hincmar, Bishop of Laon, a nephew of the Metropolitan of Reims. The younger Hincmar, a turbulent, headstrong man, finding that he was likely to be condemned by the sentence of his brethren, availed himself of the resource which was found more and more convenient by those who sought to evade justice, and appealed to the Pope. The appeal was disregarded by the French prelates, who, at the Council of Douzi in 871, pronounced Hincmar guilty, and deposed him from his see; the sentence of deposition being signed by eight Archbishops and thirteen Bishops. In their synodical epistle to Pope Adrian, these prelates begged his Holiness, if he should think proper to revise their proceedings (which they did not anticipate), to do so in the form prescribed by the Canons—namely, by appointing commissioners to examine the affair afresh in the province to which it belonged; and demanded that Hincmar should not be reinstated prior to such investigation. "For up to this time," said they, "no decree of antiquity has ever been admitted in derogation of this privilege in the Gallican and Belgic churches."† Adrian, in reply, insisted on the prerogative of his See; commanded Hincmar to attend personally at Rome to pursue his appeal; and in the mean time forbade any fresh

* Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. viii. p. 816.

† *Ibid.*, p. 1656.

appointment to the See of Laon. But the resolute opposition which he encountered both from the King (Charles the Bald) and the episcopate induced him ere long to change his tone. "Let me remind you," said the King, in a letter evidently dictated by Hincmar, "that the prerogative of St. Peter is in force, as St. Leo declares, when his decrees are founded on the laws of equity; whence it follows that if unjust they are of no authority."* And the bishops significantly remarked that before pronouncing sentence upon Hincmar, they had caused the canons of Sardica to be read in synod. The Pope now made an important concession; he promised that if Hincmar were permitted to proceed to Rome he would forbear to decide upon the case, and would cause it to be finally adjudicated in the province.† The result was that the deposition remained valid, and a successor was appointed to the See of Laon. The unfortunate Hincmar was afterwards treated with barbarous rigour; he was kept a close prisoner, and was deprived of his eyesight.

The influence of Hincmar of Reims was again clearly predominant in a council held at Pontyon in the year 876; when the Gallican prelates resisted the pretensions of Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, who had been appointed by Pope John VIII. primate and Vicar Apostolic in Gaul and Germany. The newly-crowned Emperor, Charles the Bald, who had lately returned from Rome, was present on this occasion, together with two Papal legates. The Pope's letter was read, constituting Ansegisus his representative in France, empowering him to convoke councils, and to exercise a general superintendence over ecclesiastical affairs. The Bishops desired leave to read the document for themselves; but the Emperor refused to allow this, and demanded their unqualified submission to the mandate. Upon this they replied that they were ready to obey the Pope's commands, provided always that they were in conformity with the ancient canons, and with those decrees which the Popes them-

* "Manet ergo Petri privilegium, ubicunque ex ipsius fertur acquitate iudicium, nec nimia est vel severitas vel remissio; ubi nihil erit ligatum, nihil solutum, nisi quod B. Petrus aut solverit aut ligaverit." S. Leon., Sermon. IV.

(Edit. Baller.) Decret. II., Caus. xxiv. Quæst. 1.

† Hadr. II. Papæ Epist. xix. ap. Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens*, tom. vii. p. 458.

selves had promulgated as enacted by the Councils. They were pressed by the Emperor and the legates at several successive meetings to accept the appointment unconditionally, but to no purpose; nothing was to be obtained from them beyond their former carefully guarded answer. The Bishop of Bordeaux, who was ambitious of being translated, through the favour of the Emperor, to the Archbishopric of Bourges, was the only prelate who expressed himself willing to acquiesce in the demand. The Emperor, much irritated, declared that he had authority from the Pope to carry his orders into effect in the matter, and proceeded to install Ansegisus in a chair of state next to the legates, thus establishing his primatial dignity in the face of the assembled episcopate. Hincmar protested against this as a violation of the Canons. Renewed efforts were made subsequently to induce the bishops to recognise Ansegisus in his new position; "but he obtained nothing more at the conclusion of the Council than he had done at the beginning."* There cannot be a clearer proof of the paramount importance attached by the Gallican Church to the principle of synodical legislation, and to the authority of the primitive system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hincmar inculcates this doctrine at great length and with singular power in one of his epistles.† "If," he says, "in this humble synod of ours anything has been superadded or sanctioned, through the complaisance of two or three prelates, the silence of others, or the pride of imperial power, in contravention of the sacred canons, or of Pontifical decrees promulgated agreeably to those canons, or at variance with the ancient privileges secured to every Metropolitan by the selfsame laws—if any such crude and inconsiderate measure has been broached, it must be understood that the great majority of our body did not consent to it, but most resolutely rejected it with heart and mouth; and the judgment of the majority carried with it due weight and effect—an effect which, with the help of God, will last for ever.‡ For, as S. Leo writes to Maximus, Bishop of

* Annal. Bertin. ap. Sirmond, *Concil. Antiq. Gall.*, tom. iii.

† Hincmar, *Epist.* XXX. c. 33 (Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. cxxvi. p. 208).

‡ "Generalitas nostra Deo auctore non

annuit, sed corde ac contradicente ore constantissimè abnuit; et sententia plurimorum debitum robur atque vigorem obtinuit, obtinet, ac adjuvante Domino perpetim obtinebit."

Antioch,* whatever may have been attempted, or for a time extorted by violence by any one, in opposition to the statutes of Nicæa, can do no prejudice to those inviolable decrees. Far easier were it to dissolve the bonds of any other compact, be the contracting parties whom they may, than that the regulations of the aforesaid canons should be in any particular abrogated."

Thus the Pontifical rescript in favour of Ansegisus remained practically null and void. The Archbishops of Sens assumed from that time forward the title of "Primates of Gaul and Germany;" but it was a mere nominal distinction, unattended by jurisdiction or authority.

The circumstances attending the deposition of Arnulf, Archbishop of Reims, in 991, afford another proof of Gallican tenacity in adhering to the regulations of the ancient discipline. Arnulf, a natural son of King Lothaire, had been convicted of high treason against Hugh Capet, and was in consequence deposed by a Council held at the monastery of St. Bâle, near Reims.† It was urged in his defence that the Council had proceeded irregularly; that the affair ought to have been notified in the first instance to the Pope, and that it was for him to summon a council to take cognizance of the charge and pronounce judgment. The Bishop of Orleans, who conducted the prosecution, replied that the Pope (John XV.) had been informed, that during many months the bishops had awaited his answer, and that, since none had arrived, they were justified in acting on their own authority. "The Church of Rome," said this prelate, (or rather Gerbert, who, no doubt, composed the speech which he attributes to him), "is for ever to be honoured in memory of St. Peter; and the decrees of the Popes are to be duly respected,

* S. Leo ad Maximum Antiochen. Episc. (Epist. 66, al. 92): "Si quid à quoquam contra Nicænorum canonum statuta in quâcunque synodo vel tentatum est vel ad tempus videtur extortum, nihil præjudicii potest inviolabilibus inferre decretis. Et facilius erit quorumlibet consensionum pactum dissolvi, quàm prædictorum canonum regulas ex ullâ parte corrupti."

† Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. ix. p. 738. The acts of this Council have come down to

us on the authority of Gerbert; from which circumstance Baronius disputes their authenticity, since Gerbert was undoubtedly a party nearly interested in the cause. But it is not likely that he has been guilty of serious misrepresentation, for he was surrounded by so many quick-sighted rivals, that any such fraud could hardly have escaped detection. Moreover, his account agrees closely with that of the contemporary chronicler Richer.

saving always the canons of Nicæa and of other councils, which must remain eternally in force. For we must take good heed that neither the silence nor the new constitutions of the Pope are allowed to prejudice the ancient canons of the Church. If his silence is to prevail, it follows that all laws—all the decrees of antiquity—must be suspended so long as he remains mute. But if we are to be bound by his new constitutions, where is the use of enacting laws at all, since they may be rescinded at once by the will of a single individual? Do we, then, wish to detract from the just prerogatives of Rome? By no means. But, alas! how pitiable is the condition of Rome at present! The throne of the Leos and the Gregories, of Gelasius and of Innocent, is occupied by monsters of licentiousness, cruelty, and impiety. Let us pray for the conversion of our superiors; but, meanwhile, let us look for advice and direction to some other quarter than Rome, where all is corrupt, and justice is bartered for gold.” The bishop then proceeds to comment upon the famous dicta of Popes Innocent and Gelasius, to the effect that Rome is the judge of the universal Church, while she herself cannot be judged at all; that all the world is entitled to appeal to Rome, but that from her judgment there is no appeal.* “If this be so,” says the orator, “we have at least a right to demand that the Roman Pontiff shall be one capable of pronouncing an indisputable judgment; whereas it is reported that, at present, Rome is given up to the most barbarous ignorance. But, even supposing that the present Pope were a Damasus,” he continues, “what have we done to contravene his decree?† We never attempted to decide this cause until no hope remained of our obtaining a decision from Rome. And as to holding a council

* Decret. II. Caus. IX. Qu. iii. capp. 13, 16, 17, 18.

† The bishop is evidently not aware that the decree to which he alludes is fictitious. It is one of the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, professing to be an epistle from Pope Damasus to Stephen, an archbishop of Mauritania (Decret. II. Caus. III. Qu. vi. c. 6j: “Discutere episcopos et summas ecclesiasticorum negotiorum causas Metropolitano unâ cum omnibus suis comprovincialibus, licet; sed diffinire ecclesiasticorum

summas querelas causarum, vel damnare episcopos absque hujus sanctæ sedis auctoritate, minimè licet; quoniam omnes appellare, si necesse fuerit, et ejus auxilio fulciri oportet.” The prohibition to hold councils without permission from Rome does not occur in this decretal, but in another, equally “unhistorical,” ascribed to Pope Julius (Caus. III. Qu. iv. cap. 9). Again, Dist. xvii. c. 2: “Non est rectum concilium, quod auctoritate Romanæ Ecclesiæ fultum non fuerit.” The Isi-

without his permission, the Council of Nicæa, so specially revered by Rome herself, ordains that councils shall be held in each province twice every year, without any mention of the authority of the Pope. In short," he concludes, "to avoid further disputing, if the judgment of Rome be just, we will accept it willingly; but, if unjust, let us obey the Apostle, and refuse to listen even to an angel from heaven, if he should command anything contrary to the Gospel. If Rome is silent, as in the present case, let us consult the laws of the Church. What other course is open to us, since Rome appears to be abandoned by all aid, divine and human, nay, even to have abandoned herself?"

The bishops and clergy of the province elected, as successor to Arnulf, the accomplished Gerbert, then President of the Ecclesiastical College at Reims, afterwards Pope Sylvester II.

Pope John XV. denounced these proceedings as uncanonical, and ordered another council to meet and reconsider the judgment. The bishops assembled accordingly at Chelles, and resolved that the former sentence must be confirmed; declaring, moreover, that they regarded as null and void whatever the Pope might ordain in opposition to the decrees of Councils.* Upon this the Pontiff held a synod at Rome, annulled the

dorian compilation had by this time come into vogue in the Western Church, chiefly, no doubt, in consequence of the unsettled and anarchical spirit of the age; for not only was the prevailing ignorance favourable to the fraud, but the political state of Europe was such that the ascendancy of Rome was hailed on all sides as an element of strength, and a pledge of security. The false decretals were incorporated by Gratian in his *Decretum*; and as that work acquired paramount authority in the mediæval Church, the assumed prerogatives of the Popes were thus placed upon a footing which few had either the courage or the learning to dispute. These documents occasionally find defenders in our own days; not, indeed, as having been actually written by the Pontiffs whose names they bear, but as representing in a general way the mind of the Church from the beginning upon various great principles of discipline. But if they are admitted to be ficti-

tious, the doctrines they inculcate are discredited ipso facto; for no man would embark in such a monstrous imposture, if the system which he advocated were already generally received in the Church. Moreover, this plea is refuted by the silence, and in some instances by the explicit legislation, of Councils, on the points at issue.

* "Placuit quoque sanciri, si quid à Papâ Romano contra patrum decreta suggereretur, cassum et irritum fieri, juxta quod Apostolus ait, Hæreticum hominem et ab Ecclesiâ dissentientem penitus devita. Nec minus abdic-tionem Arnulfi et promotionem Gerberti, prout ab eis ordinatæ et peractæ essent, perpetuò placuit sanciri, juxta quod in canonibus scriptum habetur, synodo provinciali statutum à nullo temerè labefactandum."—Richer, *Histor.*, Lib. iv. c. 89. ap. Pertz., *Monument. German.*, tom. iii.

deposition of Arnulf and the appointment of Gerbert, and excommunicated all the bishops who had taken part in those acts, including Gerbert himself. The French prelates, instigated by Gerbert, set at nought the sentence of interdict; and Gerbert indulged on the occasion in grossly insubordinate and abusive language against the Pope. John XV., roused into energy, sent a legate into France, who held a council at Mouson in 996,* when Gerbert was suspended from his archiepiscopal functions, until sentence should be definitively passed upon him at a future council convoked at Reims. Hugh Capet, who had warmly supported Gerbert, died at this juncture; and the loss of his patron seems to have determined the archbishop to relinquish the contest. He absented himself from the Council of Reims, and that body, under the dictation of the Pope's legate, pronounced his deposition from the see, and replaced Arnulf in his former dignity, cancelling the proceedings against the latter prelate, on the ground that a bishop could not be condemned without the consent of the Pope. This exposition of the existing discipline was apparently correct in the case of a metropolitan. On the other hand, if an accused prelate agreed to accept his episcopal brethren as his judges (which Arnulf seems to have done),† he thereby forfeited the right of appeal to Rome, and the verdict of the provincial court was final.

This whole case is much embarrassed by the political intrigues and rivalries which prevailed at the time. Arnulf represented the dethroned Carolingians; Gerbert was the partisan of the Capetian family, who had just succeeded to power. So long as Hugh Capet lived, the Gallican bishops were resolute in asserting their synodical rights, and in protesting against attempts to subvert them by the introduction of rules of discipline hitherto unheard of; and Arnulf, accordingly, was kept in prison, while Gerbert occupied the archiepiscopal throne. But no sooner had the crown descended to King Robert on the death of his father, than he entered into a secret

* *Concil. Mosomense.*, Labbe, tom. ix. p. 747.

† See his act of submission in Richer, *Histor.*, Lib. iv. c. 72: "Siquinum Archiepiscopum, &c., constitui mihi iudices delictorum meorum, et puram ipsis confessionem dedi, quærens rene-

dium poenitendi et salutem animæ meæ, ut recederem ab officio et ministerio pontificali, quo me recognosco esse indignum." The canon, "Ab electis iudicibus provocare non licet," dates from the fifth Council of Carthage, A.D. 407. (*Caus. II. Qu. vi. c. 39*).

compromise with the Pope, by which he agreed to sacrifice Gerbert, provided a dispensation were granted him for his marriage with Queen Bertha, which was objected to at Rome on the score of affinity. In consequence of this understanding, the royal influence was brought to bear upon the Council of Reims, and this, in conjunction with the powerful pressure exercised by the legate, produced the change of sentiment in that assembly, by which Gerbert was displaced and Arnulf re-established. The transitional character of the epoch, and the feebleness of the new dynasty, contributed greatly to the success of the Papal tactics on this and other like occasions. The first Capetian monarchs were but feudal chieftains, surrounded by a host of nominal vassals very little, if at all, inferior to themselves in possessions and authority. To a prince thus situated it was an object of no common importance to secure the support of the reigning Pontiff; and not unfrequently it was found convenient to purchase it by conniving at acts which were grievously prejudicial to the rights and welfare of the National Church.

The new principle propounded by Nicholas I. and his successors, on the strength of the pseudo-Decretals, that no Council was legitimate unless sanctioned by the Holy See, rendered it necessary to extend largely the system of *legations*; and this became one of the most marked features of the Papal policy during the middle ages. From the eleventh century the legates à latere were the ordinary means of communication between Rome and the provinces of the West; their powers were lavishly augmented, and all ecclesiastical affairs of any importance passed through their hands.* They were authorized to convoke Councils throughout the provinces within their legations; and in these Councils they presided, taking precedence of the Metropolitan and all other prelates. They could suspend or depose any bishop who was bold enough to question their mandates; they might reserve to the judgment of the Holy See any point upon which they could not persuade the provincial synod to endorse their views.† In this way the canonical jurisdiction of the Episcopate was virtually superseded. There were instances, doubt-

* Fleury, 4^{me} *Discours sur l'Hist. Eccles.*, No. 11.

† De Marca, *Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, Lib. vi. cap. 30, § 3.

less, in which the legatine functions were discharged to the manifest advantage of the Church ; such as that of Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII.), who, being sent to France in that capacity by Pope Victor II., fulfilled the mission with such exemplary zeal as to effect a complete revival, both doctrinal and disciplinary, among the clergy of all ranks. Nor is it to be denied that much was done by this means towards effecting general unity of ecclesiastical action—an object of essential moment, if the Church was to hold her own in the great impending struggle against feudal despotism. Nevertheless, the practice of governing by legates was not established without considerable opposition in France. Sometimes this arose from the zeal displayed by the Papal representatives in their efforts of reform, and the severe penalties which they inflicted upon clerical offenders ; as in the case of Hugues, Bishop of Die, legate of Gregory VII., who deposed the three Metropolitans of Reims, Lyons, and Sens, for simony, concubinage, and other delinquencies. But more frequently they provoked resistance by overstraining their authority, and innovating upon the usages of antiquity. Ivo of Chartres was more than once brought into collision with the legate Hugues, Archbishop of Lyons, who held the office under several Pontiffs in succession. Hugues, on one occasion, had summoned the Gallican prelates to meet in a general synod, although Pope Urban II. himself had already presided at two Councils in France within the same year. Thereupon Ivo was consulted by the king (Philip I.) as to the lawfulness of such a proceeding. He replied without hesitation that it was contrary to Apostolic institution, and to the received custom of the Church ; and that it was the king's duty, after taking counsel with the bishops of the realm, to repel such acts of injustice and oppression.* Again, the same legate refused to confirm the appointment of a newly elected Archbishop of Sens, except on the condition that he should previously acknowledge upon oath the primacy of the See of Lyons, which was a contested point between the two Metropolitans. The archbishop-elect declining to comply, Hugues forbade the bishops of the province to proceed to his consecration. This piece of presumption drew from Ivo of Chartres a letter full of dignified rebuke. He told the

* Ivon. Carnot., *Epist.* lvi. ; Baron., *Ann.* ad ann. 1100.

legate that he and his colleagues entertained profound respect for the authority which he represented, and were ready to execute at all hazards the orders of the Holy See regarding the preservation of the Faith and the correction of morals; but he bade him beware of imposing obligations as to matters indifferent, to the prejudice of the canons of the Church and the authorized customs of the Fathers. He reminded him of the celebrated maxim of Pope Zosimus, that it is not in the power even of the See of Rome to ordain anything contrary to the constitutions of the Fathers, or to make any alteration in them.* The canons, he observed, contain precise directions as to the mode of consecrating a Metropolitan; he was surprised, therefore, at the attempt to enforce on the new prelate an oath of subjection to the Archbishop of Lyons as primate, when it was notorious that no such declaration had ever yet been required, either in the province of Sens or elsewhere. In conclusion, he exhorted Hugues to turn his attention to the really important objects connected with his mission; and warned him of the danger and scandal of contending about trifles, while the weightier matters of the law are systematically neglected.†

The same high-spirited prelate addressed a stern remonstrance to Pope Paschal II., who had annulled certain acts of a Gallican Council upon a representation made by the legate. "Of what use will it be," he asks, "to celebrate Councils for the future, since their judgments, though supported by the gravest weight of authority, are liable to be reversed at any moment on the complaint of a single individual? Wherefore we entreat your Holiness to consider carefully the relative advantages and disadvantages attending such interference, and to embrace a wiser policy; so that synodical sentences may not be rescinded except in extreme cases; and that the apostolic constitutions may be more scrupulously observed."‡

The excessive amount of power enjoyed by the legates gradually rendered them odious in France, especially to the bishops, who found themselves almost dependent on the pleasure of these

* Grat. Decret. II. Caus. xxv. Qu. i. cap. 7.—"Contra statuta Patrum condere aliquid vel mutare nec hujus quidem Sedis potest auctoritas. Apud nos enim inconvulsis radicibus vivit

antiquitas, cui decreta Patrum sanxere reverentiam."

† Ivon. Carnot., Epist. lxx.

‡ Ivon. Epist. xcv. (Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. clxii.).

intrusive functionaries for their continuance in office. Their luxurious habits of living, their covetousness, their arrogant demeanour, their corrupt administration of justice, added to the general aversion they inspired; and by the time of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the legatine office had become the source of some of the most crying evils that infested the Church.* The French monarchy, in proportion as it acquired strength and stability under the kings of the "third race," applied itself vigilantly to the task of checking these abuses; an object which was successfully attained before the close of the fifteenth century. It appears that, from the first, the legates could not exercise their office without the express consent of the crown.† The Pope ascertained beforehand that the mission of the proposed legate would be acceptable to the sovereign; and the latter, in his turn, made request to the Pope whenever he desired the presence of a special envoy from Rome.‡ No sooner had the constitution acquired its modern shape, than the Courts of Parliament were charged with the duty of examining the Papal bulls appointing legates, and of making such regulations as to the discharge of their functions as might be judged needful to the security of the realm.§ Clauses were inserted by their authority in the act of verification of the royal letters patent, which stipulated that the office of the legate must be executed in conformity with the canons, the prerogatives and ordinances of the king, the laws of the realm, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the privileges of the Universities. The legate was warned that if any infraction of these rules should occur, the illegal act would be treated as null and void, and that upon complaint being made to the Parliament, it would be cancelled as "abusif." In course

* S. Bern. Epist. 290, ad Episc. Ostiensem. Fleury, 4^{me} Discours, No. 11.

† De Marca, *Concord. Sac. et Imp.*, Lib. v. cap. 56. De Héricourt, *Loix Eccles. de France*, Pt. I. cap. 7.

‡ Thus Alexander III., when preparing to send Archbishop Becket into France as legate, with a view to accommodate matters between him and Henry II., wrote to Louis VII. soliciting, with considerable earnestness, his sanction for the step. Baron. *Ann.*, ad ann. 1168. The Decretal "super gentes" (*Extravag. Decret.*, Lib. i. Tit. 1), though it asserts the absolute right of the

Roman Pontiff to appoint legates in any and every quarter of the globe, and denounces the heaviest penalties against those who refuse to receive them, plainly implies that this prerogative had been contested. Hence De Marca ascribes it to Pope Boniface VIII., who is known to have insisted strongly on this point in his proposed treaty of reconciliation with Philip the Fair. In the Codex Juris Canonici it bears the name of John XXII.

§ Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, I. Lib. ii. cap. 219; and II. Lib. i. cap. 52.

of time the following were also laid down as constitutional maxims in France: That the Pope's legate has no jurisdiction as an ecclesiastical ordinary; that he may not supersede, nor in any way disturb, the lawful jurisdiction of metropolitan and diocesan prelates; that he cannot take cognizance, in first instance, of any cause affecting the clergy; that he cannot cite before him any of the king's subjects, nor assume any sort of judicial or magisterial authority over them.* In consequence of these jealous precautions, the Pontifical legates found themselves ere long comparatively powerless. Subsequently to the reign of Philip the Fair, or at all events from the middle of the fourteenth century, Gallican synods were but rarely held under their presidency; while on the other hand Provincial Councils, canonically celebrated by the Metropolitans and their suffragans, were frequent during the same period.

During the troubles of the "great Schism," the Church of France distinguished itself by a series of memorable Councils, the results of which decided the national policy, and, indeed, the general course of ecclesiastical affairs in Europe, in those disordered times. It must be remarked, however, that the composition of these celebrated assemblies was somewhat irregular; they were not, strictly speaking, ecclesiastical synods, but rather gatherings of all the personages most eminent in rank and authority, both in Church and State. They were convened by the Crown. The right of suffrage upon the purely religious questions in debate was assigned to the prelates and clergy; the decisions at which they arrived were reported to the king, and, after having received the sanction of the royal council, were carried into effect by the joint action of the civil and spiritual authorities. The same mode of procedure was followed at the great national assembly of Bourges in 1438, which enacted the second "Pragmatic Sanction."

The organic change which practically abolished the Councils of the Church in France dates from the era of the Reformation. It appears to have originated in the pecuniary necessities and tyrannical exactions of the Crown during the "Wars of Religion." At the Colloquy of Poissy (December, 1561), the

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. vii. p. 1424 *et seqq.* Fleury, *Discours sur les Libertés Gallicanes* (Opuscules, tom. iv.).

clergy entered into an engagement with the Government to pay the interest of one of the principal public securities—the “*Rentes de l’Hotel de Ville*,”* for the space of six years ensuing. This tax, together with an immense addition for other purposes, having been duly acquitted, the same contribution was imposed for a further period of ten years; and in the sequel it became a permanent assessment on the property of the Church, under the name of the “*decime ordinaire*.” It was resisted, however, with considerable spirit, in 1579; when deputies were despatched from every province and diocese to petition Henry III. to call a general assembly of the ecclesiastical order for the settlement of the affair. With much difficulty the king was induced to consent; and the clergy were summoned to meet at Paris, with an express proviso that not more than three representatives were to be elected for each province. They assembled at Melun, and forthwith proceeded to discuss two questions in which their order was vitally interested at that day—the promulgation of the Council of Trent and the revival of free episcopal election. Their object, doubtless, was to extort concessions from the Government upon these points, in exchange for any further sacrifice of temporalities which it might be in contemplation to demand from them. They urged their wishes on the king by repeated deputations, and in most importunate terms; but altogether without satisfaction. Thus provoked, the Assembly declared in the name of the clergy that they would no longer be answerable for the annuities of the *Hotel de Ville*. Symptoms of popular irritation followed; the Parliament interfered, and the clergy were compelled to yield. They agreed to guarantee the dividends in question for an additional period of ten years; and, moreover, to pay the king an annual subsidy of 1,300,000 livres for six years.† From this date the “General Assembly of the Clergy of France” was held regularly once in ten years; and besides the decennial sessions, called “*Assemblées du Contrat*,” an intermediate meeting, the “*Assemblée des Comptes*,” took place every five years, for the purpose of auditing the accounts of the receiver-general. The former consisted of

* So called because the dividends were payable at the *Hotel de Ville* at Paris. The amount guaranteed by the clergy was reckoned at 1,600,000 livres;

which was to be paid by six equal instalments.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxxv. capp. 21, 24.

four representatives for each ecclesiastical province, two from the episcopal and two from the priestly order; making in all sixty-four members. The deputies of the second order were ecclesiastics beneficed within the province which elected them. They had the privilege of being reputed resident on their cures while attending the assembly, and during the session were exempt from arrest and civil process. The assembly nominated one or more of the prelates, being deputies, to act as presidents.

The Assembly of the clergy could not meet but by the king's command. Commissioners on behalf of the crown were appointed to open its sitting, and were the bearers of a royal missive demanding a renewal of the "contrat," and also the "don gratuit," a heavy impost disguised under that ironical name. The commissioners also communicated to the assembly the affairs which the king desired to bring under its notice; these were chiefly matters of external Church policy, which, having been discussed in the Council of State, were referred to the clergy for the benefit of their advice. All questions of theology, however, or of a purely spiritual character, were left to the discretion of the ecclesiastics themselves.

The question was mooted on several occasions, whether deputies of the second order possessed a judicial voice in discussions upon doctrine, or whether their functions were consultative only,—the decision resting solely with the bishops. This was at length determined by the Assembly of the year 1700, which ruled that pastors of the second order had no right, in virtue of their ecclesiastical status, to act as judges of doctrine; but that if their constituents distinctly stated, in the official return, that they empowered them to take part in such deliberations, in that case the Assembly would admit the claim. The power, however, must be conferred in positive terms.*

It is scarcely necessary to point out that these modern convocations of the clergy were by no means equivalent to synods of the ancient normal type. In the first place, the bishops were not present as a body, in virtue of their office as rulers of the Church, but only by a deputation of two of their number for each province; and the representation of the priesthood was still more glaringly defective—two deputies only being returned

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. viii. p. 382.

by the parochial clergy of an entire province, and these, almost invariably, members of the Cathedral Chapters. It is true that the *principle* of representation was not unfairly carried out; since a preliminary meeting was held, called the “*assemblée diocésaine*,” at which the beneficed clergy of each diocese nominated two of their body to act in the “*assemblée provinciale* ;” and by the votes of the latter the deputies were elected who were to serve in the “*assemblée générale*” at Paris. The scantiness of numbers was remedied to some extent by the practice of applying to bishops, and other persons of eminent station and merit, not being members of the Assembly, for their advice in cases of difficulty. This course was commonly taken when the Assembly was about to pass censure on books containing heterodox doctrine.*

Again, the subject-matter treated of in these Assemblies was for the most part of a temporal nature; their principal business consisted in voting supplies for the service of the Crown, and apportioning the amount to be raised among the different dioceses. It was for this reason that the Government permitted them to be held with such unfailing regularity; while on the other hand, the celebration of provincial synods,—recommended as it was by the immemorial prescription of the Church,—was, from the sixteenth century downwards, systematically discouraged, if not prohibited, by the civil authority.

And lastly, although these Assemblies were plenipotentiary, and could not be appealed from, in all affairs connected with the taxation of the clerical body, their *doctrinal* decisions carried with them no conciliar prestige, and were not regarded as binding on the conscience of the faithful. They were not empowered to enact canons; and their manifestos, though received with the respect inseparable from the position of their authors, by no means commanded the invariable and universal acquiescence of the Church.

In the interval between the quinquennial sessions of the Assembly, the affairs of the clergy were managed by two officers called “*agens-généraux du clergé*,” whose functions were of considerable importance. They were named by the ecclesiastical provinces in rotation, and held office for five years. Their

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. viii. p. 425.

duty was to watch over the interests of the Church generally, and in case of any infraction of its liberties, or other proceeding tending to its detriment, they were to forward an immediate complaint to the Crown; for which purpose they were entitled to claim personal access to the Council-board of the sovereign. In any sudden emergency requiring prompt action, the *agens-généraux* were authorized to apply to the bishops who might be in Paris or at the Court, who thereupon held an extraordinary meeting to determine the course to be taken under the circumstances.* These private episcopal conferences were often of essential service to the Church. They were not recognized by the State, inasmuch as the prelates assembled on these occasions were not formally deputed to represent their brethren. Nevertheless the influence of the government of the day was not unfrequently brought to bear upon them for the attainment of some political object;—a pressure which could hardly be resisted. This was instanced very notably at more than one critical period of the Jansenist controversy.

It must not be forgotten, that in addition to these various forms of synodical and quasi-synodical action, the Church of France anciently possessed a direct means of making its voice heard in the national councils. The clergy constituted one of the Estates of the realm, and ranked first in order of precedence. As often as the States-General were convoked, the clergy of each bailliage met, at the summons of the Governor of the province, and proceeded to elect deputies to represent them in the supreme legislature. They had the right, in common with the other two orders, of presenting to the throne a “*cahier de doléances*,” or memorial setting forth their views upon any or all branches of the public administration, and urging their demands of reformation or redress. Moreover, a certain number of clerical councillors (*conseillers-clercs*) were attached to nearly all the courts of Parliament throughout the kingdom; whose authority in civil causes was equal to that of the lay magistrates. In the reign of Philip VI. there were fifty *conseillers-clercs* in the Parliament of Paris alone.

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. viii. p. 737.

V.

THE supremacy of the Church in her judicial capacity—and indeed the entire system of ecclesiastical polity elaborated by Gregory VII., and other Pontiffs of like calibre—was accepted in France for many ages with the same submission as in other parts of Christendom; and the clergy shared largely in the general ascendancy which thus accrued to their order. The essential principles of that system were proclaimed by none with more clearness and ability than by the great Gallican theologians of the twelfth century;—such as Geoffrey of Vendome, Hugh of St. Victor, Ivo of Chartres, Hildebert of Le Mans, and Bernard of Clairvaux. These writers teach that the temporal power, no less than the spiritual, is ordained by God; they maintain the distinction, and the mutual independence, of the two elements; but they concur in extolling the spirituality as immeasurably superior to the temporality; and affirm that, in consequence, the Church must exercise a certain dominant influence over the whole economy of human government. Some few theorists of extreme views (for instance, John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres) went so far as to attribute to the Church, or rather to the Pope, a direct authority, of Divine right, over the administration of all temporal affairs.* But the more common opinion reduced it to an indirect influence, arising from the unquestionable prerogative of the Church as the instructor and guide of conscience. All baptized Christians, it was argued, are subject to the control of the Church in matters of faith and religious duty. The Gospel is not one thing for the multitude and another perfectly different thing for monarchs and nobles. The prince, in common with his meanest vassal, is committed to the pastoral oversight of those whom Christ commissioned to feed His flock; and it belongs, therefore, to them to inform and direct his conscience as to the right administration of his trust. As a Catholic, he is the son of the Church, not its governor; in things pertaining to religion, it is his place to be a learner, not a teacher.† Such was the simple basis of a system which, in its organized application to

* See his curious treatise entitled "Polycraticus," in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Bigne), tom. xxiii.

† Decret. I. Dist. xcvi. cap. 11: "Imperatores debent Pontificibus subesse, non præesse."

the details of government and the diversified realities of life, ruled the world for upwards of five centuries.

Though founded on a great and indisputable truth, it became dangerous at length, by reason of the false deductions which were drawn from it. For it was inferred that, in case of serious delinquency in faith or morals, a sovereign was amenable to corrective discipline; and that, as a last resource, he might be excommunicated. Now, according to the prevailing belief of those days, the ban of excommunication carried with it penal consequences, not only of a spiritual, but of a temporal and civil nature. A monarch under such an infliction, being cut off from the unity of the Christian body, was deemed no longer fit to bear rule over Christians. From this latter fact, then, an extreme conclusion was arrived at, radically subversive of all monarchical authority; namely, that if the offender remained stubbornly impenitent, it was competent to the Pope to absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and practically to depose him from the throne.

Nor were these mere theoretical maxims, confined to dry treatises of theology, to the conventual cloister, or the lecture rooms of Universities. The world beheld them, in many memorable instances, logically reduced to practice. Several Carlovin-
gian princes—Louis le Debonnaire, Lothaire, Charles the Bald—were dethroned by the authority of Gallican synods; and the legality of the proceeding was questioned by no man; nay, was acknowledged by the deposed monarchs themselves.* King Robert, again, was excommunicated by Pope Gregory V.; Philip I. by Gregory VII.; Philip Augustus by Innocent III., who, moreover, kept the whole of France under an interdict for eight months. Even the heirs of the Cæsars—Henry IV., Henry V., Frederick II.—had cause to rue the day when they presumed to measure themselves against the mysterious theocracy represented by the Vicar of Christ.

Geoffrey, Abbot of Vendôme and Cardinal, A.D. 1095, is said to have been the first to point out the mystical significance of the “two swords” in the Gospel of St. Luke.† This fanciful interpretation soon became popular with ecclesiastical writers;

* See the declaration of Charles the Bald before the bishops assembled at the Council of Savonnières, or Toul, A.D.

859.—Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. viii.

† See Gosselin, *Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*, Pt. II. cap. 3.

and an argument was derived from it which was seriously regarded as establishing the supremacy of the Pope over both worlds, spiritual and temporal. Such is the use made of the allegory by St. Bernard, in a well-known passage of his treatise "*De Consideratione*," addressed to Pope Eugenius III.* "If any one should deny that the material sword belongs to you, I think he cannot have paid attention to the words of Christ, who commanded Peter to put up his sword into the sheath. This sword, then, is assuredly *yours*, to be drawn at your demand, although by other hands than yours. If it were not at your disposal, when the Apostles said, Lord, behold here are two swords, our Lord, instead of answering, It is enough, would have said, It is too much. The two swords, then, belong to the Church—the spiritual and the material. It is for the Church herself to draw the spiritual sword, by the hands of the sovereign Pontiff; the material sword is to be drawn in defence of the Church, by the hands of the soldier, at the solicitation of the Pope and by order of the prince." Again, in a letter to the Cardinals who had just elected Pope Eugenius, Bernard exclaims, "God forgive you! what have you done? Was there no man to be found of greater wisdom and experience, who would have been better qualified for so high an office? In truth it seems ridiculous to choose a poor creature covered with rags (Eugenius was a Cistercian monk) to rule over princes, to give laws to bishops, to dispose of kingdoms and empires. Was this a man to gird on the sword and execute vengeance on the people—to bind their kings in chains and their nobles with links of iron?"†

A remarkable statement to the same effect occurs in the writings of Hugh, Abbot of St. Victor at Paris, another mediæval doctor of high repute. Speaking of the two principles of government, "the one," he says, "is called the temporal, the other the spiritual; both contain different orders and degrees of power; but on each side they are dependent on a single head, from which they derive as from their source and root of unity. The temporal power has for its head the prince; the head of the spiritual is the sovereign Pontiff. To the royal authority belong all things which are earthly and connected with the natural

* S. Bern., *De Considerat.*, Lib. iv. cap. 3 (Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. clxxxii.).

† S. Bern., *Epist.* 227, ad Cardinales.

life; all that is spiritual, all that appertains to the spiritual life, is placed under the government of the supreme Pontiff. But by how much the spiritual life is nobler than the earthly, and the soul than the body, in that proportion the spiritual power exceeds in honour and dignity that which is earthly or secular. For to the spiritual power it belongs both to establish the earthly, that it may exist, and to judge it, if it should act amiss. But the spiritual power itself is instituted by God alone, and if it should err, it can be judged by none but Him; as it is written, The spiritual man judgeth all things, but he himself is judged of no man." He then shows from the Old Testament history that the priestly office was first instituted by God, and the royal authority afterwards organized through its ministry. "Hence in the Christian Church the bishops still consecrate kings, both sanctifying their power by benediction, and forming it by institution. If then, according to the Apostle, he who blesseth is greater than him who is blessed, it follows manifestly that the temporal power is inferior to the spiritual, from which it receives benediction."*

It was easy thus to define in words the comparative nature and functions of ecclesiastical and political authority; but, in practical operation, the system was found to involve insuperable difficulties. The spiritual and the temporal are ideas distinct in theory, but as a matter of experience neither element confines itself strictly to its proper sphere. Who will undertake to fix the precise point where the purely spiritual ends and the purely temporal begins? It is probably impossible, under any circumstances, that the balance should be maintained at an exact equipoise. It has been in all ages a history of alternate action and reaction—of aggression and repulse. Nay, even the theory of the Hildebrandine school is inconsistent with itself; for, if once it be admitted that the Church, represented by the Pope, possesses a directive power over the civil ruler, and may take cognizance of his acts judicially in case of alleged error, the independence of the two principles, however affirmed in words, is in fact overthrown. Such a prerogative is capable of indefinite extension. It may be so exercised as to be a means of perpetual interference with the ordinary administration of civil affairs; for what human government is exempt from error? If every instance.

* Hugo de S. Viet, *De Sacram.*, Lib. ii. Pt. II. cap. 3 (Migne, *Patrolog.*, tom. 176).

of mistaken judgment, every act of unwise or unjust policy, on the part of a civil ruler, were liable to be arraigned and corrected by the magisterium of the Church, an utter subversion must follow of the Divinely-ordained scheme of government. The temporal power would be neutralized and absorbed by the spiritual.

A tendency towards anomalies of this kind was early manifested in the dealings of the Papacy with the great monarchies of Europe. For instance, Innocent III., in the year 1199, attempted to impose his arbitration on the kings of France and England, under the plea that peace was necessary in order that they might turn their combined arms against the infidel. On this occasion the Pontiff explained at length, in a letter to the Gallican bishops, that he did not pretend to adjudicate disputed questions about feudal rights, but claimed to decide "concerning sin,—the censure of which belongs, beyond all doubt, to us, and we are bound to exercise it in respect of all persons whatsoever." * He founds this claim upon the precept of our Lord, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault," &c. . . . "And if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." "Let not the king, then," continues Innocent, "account it injurious to his dignity to submit himself to the judgment of the Apostolic See in this matter, after the example of Valentinian, Theodosius, and other illustrious princes. For we do not rely on any human constitution, but on the Divine law; our authority is not from man, but from God. No man of sane mind is ignorant that it appertains to our office to correct any and every Christian in respect of mortal sin; and if he should despise our correction, to enforce it by means of ecclesiastical penalties." † The right thus insisted on to pronounce and execute judgment in all cases "in respect of sin," gave an incalculable advantage to the ecclesiastical over the temporal authority. Any intrusion of the lay element into the spiritual domain was an act of sacrilege—of impious rebellion against the Divine economy; whereas, on the other hand, the

* See *Decretal. Greg. IX.*, Lib. ii. Tit. i. cap. 13, Novit.

† "Quum enim non humanæ constitutioni, sed Divinæ legi potius innititur, quia potestas nostra non est ex homine sed ex Deo; nullus qui sit

sanæ mentis ignorat quin ad officium nostrum spectet de quocumque mortali peccato corripere quemlibet Christianum, et si correctionem contempserit, ipsum per districtiorem ecclesiasticam coercere."

Pope possessed the means of exercising, though indirectly, unlimited jurisdiction in things temporal; he might interpose in the concerns of civil government as often as he judged it necessary either for the personal welfare of the sovereign or for the general interests of the Church. This extraordinary system—which in the great war of Investitures had triumphed over the combined antagonism of the proudest dynasties of Europe—was destined to receive its death-blow in France. The crisis arrived in the opening years of the fourteenth century. The events which then occurred were of extreme gravity, not only as regards the history of the relations between Church and State in France, but as practically decisive of the entire question between secular and Pontifical authority throughout the world.

Philip the Fair and Pope Boniface VIII., the principal combatants on this memorable occasion, were well matched, both in point of ability and resolution; each alike confident of the justice of his cause; the one no less determined to establish the independence of his throne and temporal sovereignty than the other to uphold what he considered the indefeasible liberties of the Church, and the supremacy of its “magisterium” over all orders and ranks of Christians.

The Pope, however, laboured under one disadvantage, and it was fatal. The principles for which he strove were indeed the very same that his predecessors, Gregory VII., Alexander III., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Gregory IX., had illustrated with such marvellous success. But the *times* were not the same; the tide of public feeling had turned, and was setting powerfully in an opposite direction; and whereas the decrees of former Pontiffs had been accepted with unreasoning submission, Boniface was destined to be met by reckless criticism, insolent rebuke, and even by vindictive violence. Moreover his personal character was unhappily such as to aggravate the difficulties of his situation. Arrogant, irritable, peremptory, headstrong, his every movement fanned the flame of strife, and infused into it a bitterness which forbade the hope of accommodation. Such has been the case repeatedly in the most eventful conjunctures of the world’s history. Inability to read the signs of the times, want of tact, want of calm judgment, of moderation, of perception of the proper moment, manner, and limits of concession,—these are faults which have proved the ruin of empires quite as often as

misdeeds of deeper dye; and it was through such faults that the vast fabric of Roman supremacy in things temporal was shaken to its centre by the despotic monarchy of France.

With regard to the original ground of quarrel, Philip was clearly in the wrong; for his favourite tax, the "maltôte," having never been sanctioned by the Pope, could not be imposed upon the clergy according to the existing provisions of the law.* In condemning this irregular proceeding, then (by the bull "Clericis laicos"),† Boniface did no more than enunciate a principle which was confessedly in force, although it had been repeatedly violated in practice. But the tone and language which he employed in doing this were so extravagant, that the King could hardly recede without compromising his dignity. He persisted, therefore, in asserting his right, as a matter of principle, to tax the clergy; but he argued *à priori*, as if there had been no legislative enactments in existence on the subject. "The kings of France," he said, "have always possessed the power of taking necessary measures for the defence and preservation of the realm against its enemies. The Church does not consist of the clergy only, but of the laity also. Christ purchased freedom from sin and from the yoke of the ancient law for clergy and laity alike; and therefore the clergy have no right to appropriate to themselves exclusively that liberty which belongs to the whole Christian body. Special privileges have indeed been granted to the ministers of the Church by the Popes, at the instance or with the consent of secular princes; but such privileges cannot

* The third Lateran Council, A.D. 1179, prohibited the lay magistrate from assessing on the Church or her ministers any portion of the fiscal or municipal duties levied upon other citizens (Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. x.) This was confirmed by the fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which, however, permitted the clergy to make voluntary contributions for State purposes, with the previous approbation of the bishops and of the Pope (Can. XLIV., Labbe, tom. xi. See also the Decretal of Alexander IV., "Quia nonnulli," Lib. iii. Tit. xxiii. cap. 1). Corresponding enactments were made by many provincial Synods. Cf. Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, III. Lib. i. cap. 42. Nevertheless, a large proportion of the

national revenue was derived in process of time, under one pretext or another, from the clergy; inasmuch that the payment of "decimes" became an annual charge upon their incomes in France. Yet this was presumed in all cases to be spontaneous, an act of liberality and bounty suggested by the authorities of the Church herself; nor could it be enforced without the express consent of the episcopate.

† Feb. 24, 1296. This bull is inserted in the Corpus Juris Canonici, *Sext. Decretal.*, Lib. iii. Tit. xxiii. cap. 3. It was revoked by the Council of Vienne under Clement V. in 1311. See *Clement.*, Lib. iii. Tit. xvii., "De immunitate Ecclesiarum."

deprive the sovereign of what is indispensably required for the good government and integrity of his dominions. The clergy are subjects of the crown, members of the body politic, like other men; and are in consequence bound to contribute towards its preservation. It is contrary to the law of nature to excuse them from this obligation, while they are permitted to waste the property of the Church in luxuries of dress and equipage, in banquets and other worldly vanities." These were truths undeniable in themselves, but inconclusive in the case in hand; for it was a notorious fact that the clergy were not, with respect to liability to State taxation, on the same footing with other classes; that they were exempted from it by long continued usage, resting on the canons of Councils, which had been recognised and confirmed by the State itself. The gist of Philip's argument was, that they *ought not* to enjoy such exemption; in other words, that the legislation of past ages was mistaken, and required amendment. His object was to make a radical change in the system as it stood; to do away with all distinction between clergy and laity, so far as concerned the duty of replenishing the public exchequer. This might be a politic enterprise in the interest of royalty; but it was one which the Pope, from his point of view, might not unfairly resist.

Moved, however, by the representations of the Archbishop of Reims and his clergy, who anxiously deprecated a collision between the Church and the civil power,* Boniface, in a second bull,† put forth a conciliatory explanation of the first. His prohibition, he said, was meant to apply to compulsory imposts, not to voluntary contributions. It did not include, again, the customary payments due from bishops and other ecclesiastics in respect of their temporal fiefs held under the Crown. Nor did it touch the case of a great and sudden exigency, when all the resources of the kingdom were required to repel the invasion of a foreign foe. These concessions, though somewhat tardy, were graciously received by Philip; he expressed himself satisfied, and the misunderstanding was apparently at an end.

But a fresh breach was occasioned not long afterwards by the

* See the "*Supplicatio facta Papæ per Archiepisc. Remens. et suffraganeos suos*," Dupuy, *Preuves*, &c., i. p. 26.

† "*Ineffabilis amoris*," Feb. 7, 1297.

affair of Bernard de Saisset, Bishop of Pamiers ; and here the consequences were more serious. Boniface had erected Pamiers, heretofore a convent of Canons Regular, into an Episcopal See ; and had nominated Bernard de Saisset the first bishop, by his own sole authority, without consulting with the Metropolitan of the province, or the king. This proceeding Philip allowed to pass in silence. The new prelate, an ambitious, violent man, assumed the temporal lordship of Pamiers, to the prejudice of the Comte de Foix, to whom it had been granted by the Crown. Finding the Count too strong for him, he sought assistance from the Pope ; and Boniface appealed to Philip to support the refractory bishop against his lawful superior. It is not surprising that the monarch declined a request so totally opposed to all the principles of feudalism. Upon this Boniface proceeded, in a spirit of singular bad taste and gratuitous insolence, to appoint Saisset, whom the king could not but regard as a rebellious vassal, his legate or nuncio at the court of France. In this quality it appears that Saisset was guilty of offensive and even treasonable language against Philip ; who, losing patience, caused the bishop to be suddenly arrested, and committed to the custody of his Metropolitan, the Archbishop of Narbonne. A special envoy, Pierre Flotte, was then despatched to Rome, to demand that the prisoner might be forthwith degraded from the episcopal office and stripped of every privilege belonging to the clerical order, so that the king might cause justice to be done upon him by the secular arm, as an incorrigible offender.

Philip damaged his cause by these precipitate acts. To arrest the Pope's nuncio was a violation of the law of nations, to say nothing of the acknowledged privileges of the clergy ; and what could be more palpably unjust than to summon the Pope to degrade his own representative, upon a mere vague charge unsubstantiated by proof ? Boniface was fully justified in resisting the demand ; and had his resistance been conducted with moderation, there is reason to believe that it would have terminated in his favour. As it was, he allowed himself to be hurried by resentment into a series of measures which, after exposing him to unparalleled indignities, at length brought his life to a pitiable close.

On one and the same day, December 5, 1301, the angry

Pontiff despatched five separate bulls or rescripts to France. The first contained a request or command to Philip to set the Bishop of Pamiers immediately at liberty, to restore to him all his possessions which had been seized on his arrest, and to permit him to proceed freely to the Pope's presence at Rome. This document was not intemperately worded, though it intimated that the king had incurred the sentence of excommunication by laying violent hands upon a bishop. But it was accompanied by others couched in a more trenchant style. By the "Salvator mundi," Boniface revoked all the privileges which he had granted to Philip (such as the "regale" in certain churches, "decimes" to be levied on the clergy, &c.), alleging that they had been scandalously abused. The "Ausculta, fili," commenced with an unqualified assertion of the subordination of the temporal authority to the spiritual. "God has set me, though unworthy, above kings and kingdoms, having imposed upon me the yoke of Apostolic servitude, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant, in His name. Wherefore let no man persuade you that you have no superior, or that you are not subject to the supreme head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He who thinks so is a madman, and, if he persists in his error, is convicted as an infidel." The Pope then enters on an elaborate detail of his complaints against Philip. "Although it is certain that the nomination to all benefices belongs to the Pope,* and that you can have no right to any such patronage without the consent of the Holy See, you oppose our collations, and claim to act as judge in your own cause. You drag before your tribunals the bishops and other clergy of your kingdom, both regular and secular, even for matters concerning property which they do not hold from you in fief. You exact from them tenths and other imposts, although laymen have no authority whatever over the clergy. You hinder the bishops from employing the spiritual sword against offenders, and from exercising their jurisdiction over conventual houses. You observe no moderation in disposing of the revenues of vacant episcopal sees, which you call, by an abuse, the 'droit de régale.' You squander these revenues, and

* This sweeping assumption seems to have been first made by Pope Clement IV. in 1267. See *Sext. Decretal.*, Lib. iii. Tit. iv., "De præbendis et dignitatibus," cap. 2.

then turn into plunder what was intended as a means of preserving them intact." He announces, in conclusion, that, out of pastoral solicitude for his soul's health, and for the reputation of a kingdom which is dear to him, he has summoned the archbishops and bishops, the abbots, and superior clergy of France, to appear before him at Rome, that he may there deliberate upon the affairs of his realm with persons devoted to its interests, and whom he (the king) could have no reason to suspect.

The bull convoking the French prelates and clergy to assemble in Council at Rome was expedited on the same day.

The "Ausculta, fili," convinced Philip that the real drift of the Pope's policy was nothing less than to destroy the substantive reality of monarchical power; and that he must either prepare to fight the battle to the last extremity, or consent to hold his crown as a dependency of the Holy See. He took his measures with characteristic vigour. He caused the Nuncio, Jacques des Normands, who had brought the obnoxious bulls to France, to be conducted under a guard to the frontier, in company with the Bishop of Pamiers, whom he banished for ever from the realm. The "Ausculta, fili" (or, as some historians think, an abridgment of it, expressed in still more insulting terms)* was publicly burnt at Paris. And lastly, on the 10th of April, 1302, the king held a grand Parliament, or meeting of the three estates of the kingdom, in the cathedral of Notre Dame, and frankly asked the advice of his people in the critical state of his relations with the Holy See. Was it their opinion that the sovereign was subject to the Bishop of Rome, not only in spirituals, but as to the conduct of his temporal government? Was the kingdom of France an independent monarchy, or was it held in feudal vassalage from the Pope? To this question the nobles and the deputies of the commons responded, with unanimous enthusiasm, that the crown was held of God alone, and that they were ready to sacrifice both property and life rather than submit to the outrageous usurpations of Pope Boniface, even if the king himself were not disposed to withstand them. The clergy, however,

* See H. Martin, *Hist. de Fr.*, tom. iv. p. 429. This "smaller bull" was in all probability not from the hand of Boniface, but substituted for the genuine

bull for circulation in France, for the sake of inflaming the popular resentment. Guettée, *Hist. de l'Egl. de Fr.*, tom. vi. p. 249.

hesitated. They were not incapable, as they had often shown, of resisting the unconstitutional claims and exactions of the Popes; but on the other hand, they entertained no small apprehension of the despotic character of Philip, and shrunk from the prospect of a struggle which might possibly end in a violent severance of the National Church from the centre of unity. At first they endeavoured to evade a direct reply; urging that the Pope's language had been misunderstood, and that he by no means intended to assume any supremacy in things temporal over the Crown and Government in France. This explanation, however, was not accepted; and such was the prevailing exasperation against Boniface, that the representatives of the clergy were constrained at length to give in their adhesion to the votes of the other two orders. They entreated the king to allow them to proceed to Rome according to the Pope's citation; but this was positively refused. They then addressed a pathetic letter to the Pope, to acquaint him of the imminent danger of a schism between France and Rome, and of a rupture between the clerical order and the people. "The laity shun us," they said, "and exclude us from their society, as if we sought to betray them. They despise the censures of the Church, by whomsoever pronounced, and use every precaution to make them ineffectual. In this extremity we have no resource but to appeal to your prudence; and we implore you, with tears in our eyes, to preserve the ancient union of the Church with the State, and to consult our safety by revoking the orders you have sent us to repair to your presence." Boniface, in reply, rebuked them for their pusillanimity in yielding to the dictation of a tyrannical prince and his council, and threatened them with punishment if they disobeyed his summons to Rome. "To deny the subjection of the temporal power to the spiritual," said he, "and to assert that they are independent powers, is nothing less than to set up two contradictory principles, like the Manichean heretics."

An attempt was now made to adjust the quarrel by means of negotiation and mutual explanation. Four French prelates were despatched to Rome for this purpose. The Pope, receiving them in full consistory, expatiated in a bland and conciliatory tone on his anxious desire to preserve the harmony which had existed in all ages between the realm of France and the Apostolic See. To pretend that he had ever laid claim to any

superiority over Philip as to temporal jurisdiction was, he declared, a malicious falsehood, invented by Pierre Flotte for his own wicked purposes. He had never advanced any such senseless opinion, well knowing that the power of temporal and of spiritual government are alike ordained of God. "At the same time," continued Boniface, "the King cannot deny that he owes submission to the Roman Pontiff *in respect of sin*"* (*ratione peccati*).

This phrase, "in respect of sin," so frequent in the mouths of the Popes of the middle age, contains the key to their whole line of policy with regard to the question in dispute. It is true that they did not claim any direct jurisdiction over princes as to their administration in things temporal; but *indirectly*, in virtue of their functions as supreme directors in matters of conscience, their pretensions amounted nearly, if not altogether, to the same thing.† Kings, in common with all other Christians, were responsible to the Church "in respect of sin"—that is, in respect of her right to guide the conscience. Upon this plea it is obvious that the Pope might claim to arbitrate in any and every case within the range of human action. It belonged to him to judge how far, under any given circumstances, the parties concerned had incurred the guilt and penalties of sin. The keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were in his custody; it was for him to bind or to loose, to condemn or to absolve, according to his view of the requirements of due spiritual discipline. As a dogma of the Catholic Church, this was incontestable in the abstract; the existence of such power was universally admitted, and was believed to reside essentially in the person of the Pope. But its application, with reference to limits, method, and detail, was a matter of infinite delicacy and difficulty. The Pope might exaggerate, misconstrue, or abuse this power; and if he should

* Cf. De Marca, *De Concord.*, Lib. iv. cap. 16, § 4.

† Even the Gallican Gerson maintains, in this sense, the full extent of the Pontifical prerogative. "We do not affirm that kings and princes hold their dominions from the Pope and the Church, so that the Pope is supreme over all in point of civil and judicial administration, a pretension wrongly ascribed by some to Boniface VIII. Nevertheless,

all men, including princes, are amenable to the Pope, in so far as they may abuse their temporal jurisdiction by offences against the law of God and nature: and this supremacy may be called a *directive* and *ordinative* power rather than civil or judicial."—Gers., *Serm. de pace et unione Græcorum*, Opp., tom. ii. p. 147. Cf. Fénelon, *De Summ. Pont. Auctor.*, cap. 27.

do so to an exorbitant or scandalous degree, a hostile reaction was sooner or later inevitable. The elements of such a reaction had long been in course of preparation both in France and elsewhere; and the actual outburst was merely a question of time.

The French envoys failed to obtain any concession from Boniface as to the convocation of the Council at Rome. It was held accordingly at the time appointed; and was attended, in defiance of the King's prohibition, by four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, and six abbots, of the Gallican Church. Immediately afterwards appeared the famous constitution, "*Unam sanctam*" *—a document which in style and language was insufferably provoking, although in point of doctrine it contained nothing that had not been repeatedly advanced before, and expressed, indeed, the common belief of Catholics at that day. It commences by asserting the unity of the Church as the body of Christ, and that it is governed under Christ by St. Peter and his successors. Then follows a quotation of the well-worn passage from St. Bernard, concerning the "two swords" and their mutual relations.† The Bull goes on to state that it belongs to the spiritual power to establish the temporal, and to judge it if it fails in its duty; according to the words of the Almighty by the prophet, "Behold, I have set thee over nations and kingdoms," &c.‡ When the temporal power errs, it must be judged by the spiritual; when an inferior spiritual power transgresses, it must be judged by its superior; but if the supreme authority shall be in fault, it is accountable to God alone; it cannot be reached by human judgment, as the Apostle testifies—"He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man."§ This authority is not human, though exercised by human hands; but rather Divine, having been divinely granted to Peter and his successors in the words, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, &c. Whosoever resists the authority which

* *Extravag. Commun.*, Lib. i. Tit. viii. cap. 1, "De majoritate et obedientiâ."

† See *suprà*, p. 55.

‡ Jeremiah i. 10.

§ This is a literal citation from Hugo de S. Victor, *De Sacram.* Lib. ii. p. 2, cap. 4: "Spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem et instituere habet, ut sit, et judicare, si bona non fuerit; ipsa verò à Deo primum instituta est;

et cum deviat, à solo Deo judicari potest, sicut est scriptum, spiritualis homo dijudicat omnia et ipse à nemine judicatur."—1 Cor. ii. 15. The famous canon "Si Papa" (*Dist.* 40, cap. 6) inculcates the same doctrine, expressly excepting, however, the case of a Pope guilty of heresy: "Cunctos judicaturus à nemine est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur à fide devius."

God has thus constituted, resisteth the ordinance of God. To deny this is nothing less than the Manichean heresy of two co-ordinate principles. Wherefore we declare, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary to the salvation of every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." This conclusion was not so formidable, after all, as might have been expected from the premises. From such an unqualified statement of the subjection of earthly authority to spiritual, the Pope might have drawn the inference that civil rulers are answerable to the Church, and to the judgment of its head, for the entire conduct of their ordinary government. Instead of this, he contents himself with a general declaration of the necessity of obedience to the Apostolic See—a sentiment which in that age was disputed by no man, but to which, nevertheless, different individuals began to attach different meanings.

The bull "*Unam sanctam*" was followed by a sentence of excommunication against all persons, of whatever degree, who should molest, despoil, or impede those who desired to proceed to or return from Rome. This was, of course, directed against Philip, although it did not designate that prince by name. He had seized and confiscated the property of the bishops who chose to obey the Papal summons contrary to the commands of their temporal sovereign.

Philip replied to these denunciations by holding a second great Council on the 1st of December, 1302, when it was enacted that no French subject could leave the kingdom without the King's consent, under pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of goods; and a renewed prohibition was published against exporting from France money, jewels, horses, and munitions of war.

The crisis was evidently at hand. But before resorting to extremities, Boniface sent the Cardinal Le Moine, by birth a Frenchman, as his legate to Philip, charged to make certain propositions by way of satisfaction to the Apostolic See. The following were the principal articles insisted on:—That the King should revoke his prohibition to the clergy to proceed to Rome; and should acknowledge that the Pope has the right to nominate to all benefices, to dispose of their revenues, and to levy duties upon them. He was further to own that no sovereign can lawfully seize the property of the Church, nor summon ecclesiastics to lay tribunals, either in personal actions or in

regard to estates which were not held of him in fief. Moreover, he was to engage to correct the prevalent abuses of the *droit de regale*, and to preserve the revenues of vacant churches for the future incumbents. He was to remove all hindrances to the due exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. He was to repair the evil which he had committed by debasing the coinage of the realm; and, finally, he was to treat the city of Lyons and its territory as independent of the crown of France. It was not likely, and probably was not expected, that a prince of Philip's imperious temper would accept such terms in their full extent. He replied, however, in a tone of moderation. It was from no want of respect for the Church that he had forbidden the prelates to quit France, but simply by reason of circumstances which appeared to him of a dangerous nature. He was willing to restore the property of those who had gone to Rome without his permission. Far from wishing to obstruct the liberty of the spiritual sword, he was prepared to support it, so long as it observed the bounds of law and established usage. If any of his officers had abused their powers in this respect, he was ready to punish them and to rectify their mistakes. If any one had been wronged in the administration of the *droit de regale*, he offered to satisfy him by reimbursement. With reference to the disposal of benefices, the seizure of temporalities, and the citation of ecclesiastics before the civil courts, he had followed, and would always follow, the customs generally received in the realm. As to the alterations in the coinage, he had been forced to adopt them by the necessities of the State, but he had already taken steps for remedying the evils caused by that measure. Finally, he declared himself sincerely desirous to maintain the ancient union between the Roman See and France, and he entreated the Pope not to imperil it by attacking the liberties and privileges of the Gallican Church.

We have in this last sentence one of the earliest symptoms of that wilful misapprehension of the "Gallican liberties," which became in the sequel so convenient an instrument of royal despotism. The faults of Pope Boniface were neither few nor small. He might have been justly accused of striving to exalt the dominion of the spiritual power to a pitch incompatible with the rights and functions of the crown; but certainly he was not chargeable with seeking to *abridge* the liberties of the Church,

as they were then established by general usage. It was the King, not the Pope, who was labouring to extinguish the immunities immemorially enjoyed by the ecclesiastical order. The "liberty of the Church," in the sense in which it was invoked by Philip and other subsequent monarchs of like character, signified in reality that the clergy, instead of being as heretofore dependent on the Pope, were to be practically subject to the crown. In the very act of redressing grievances arising from a jurisdiction which, though wrongly exercised, was in its essence real and true, they substituted for it the yoke of another jurisdiction which had no legitimate foundation whatever.

The professions of Philip may or may not have been made with perfect sincerity. In any case they ought to have called forth further exertions on the part of Boniface to effect an understanding. Instead of this, he now ordered his legate to excommunicate the king by name; including in the sentence all nobles, prelates, and magistrates who might support or countenance him. Philip, unmoved by thunders which had scared some of the boldest of his predecessors, summoned forthwith his Council at the Louvre, and caused a formal act of accusation to be published against the Pope, charging him with having usurped his office, with heresy, with simony, infidelity, and other monstrous offences. He declared his intention to procure with all despatch the convocation of a General Council, as the proper tribunal to take cognizance of so grave a cause, and appealed to its decision, and that of a legitimate Pope, on the questions in dispute. The ecclesiastics present, as well as the other two orders, signified their assent to this impeachment of Boniface, though they expressed their belief that he would fully clear himself from the crimes imputed to him. Twenty-six prelates, with eleven abbots, signed the act of appeal; and no fewer than nine cardinals concurred in the measure.

Boniface repudiated with contemptuous scorn the notion that he could be arraigned judicially before a General Council. "What?" he said, "do they demand a Council to sit in judgment on the Pope? No Council can be assembled but by me, and with me." Philip, however, urged on by the "legistes,"—a class rapidly rising into power, and rancorous in its hostility to Boniface and the Holy See—persisted in his scheme, canvassed actively for support in Spain and other foreign countries, and

sent special envoys to the Italian cardinals to secure their adhesion and their presence at the forthcoming Council, which it was proposed to hold at Lyons. Guillaume de Nogaret, one of the most unscrupulous of Philip's councillors, was charged, or charged himself, with the task of personally summoning the Pope to attend at the appointed time and place. In case of resistance to this mandate, his Holiness was to be forcibly compelled to submit.

Boniface, upon this, retired from Rome to Anagni, and prepared to launch against his adversary that most tremendous bolt of the Pontifical artillery, a bull releasing Philip's subjects from their allegiance, and declaring him deposed from the throne. His kingdom was bestowed upon Albert, King of the Romans.

This document was to have been solemnly promulgated in the cathedral of Anagni on the 8th of September, 1303, the festival of the Nativity of the Virgin. But on the day preceding, Nogaret, who had prevailed upon the principal citizens of Anagni to favour his design, entered the town at the head of 300 soldiers, invaded the palace, and presented himself abruptly before the aged Pontiff, whom he found seated on his throne, and wearing the tiara and other ensigns of his Apostolic office. Sciarra Colonna, who accompanied Nogaret, assailed him with savage reproaches, and is said to have been brutal enough to strike him on the face with his iron gauntlet. Boniface was seized forthwith, and committed to prison, in order, as his captors said, to ensure his appearance at the Council at Lyons. The people of Anagni, however, resenting these outrages, rose *en masse* against the French, drove them with severe loss from the city, restored the Pope to liberty, and conducted him in triumph to Rome. But his fate approached. At the age of upwards of eighty, it was scarcely possible that he should rally from the shock of the violence and barbarous treatment to which he had been subjected. The iron had entered into his soul. He was attacked by fever, which produced delirium and frenzy; and death released him from his sufferings on the 11th of October, 1303.

The opposition excited by the abuse of power, whether spiritual or temporal, is seldom satisfied with redressing the particular grievance from which it arose. When thus far successful, it is

commonly impelled forward, and occupies fresh ground; it advances unjust pretensions, invades established rights, and becomes in its turn intolerably oppressive. The victory of Philip over Boniface—the violent recoil of that Pontiff's extravagance upon his own head—was no mere isolated episode of history; it was a turning point in the constitutional system of Europe. It was the commencement of a widespread reaction, on the part of the laity, against ecclesiastical predominance. From that time forward may be traced a clear and continuous current of opposition, not merely to the uncanonical encroachments of the Papacy, but to the rightful independence of the Church, and the legitimate exercise of its jurisdiction. The uniform tendency of legislation in France, from the fourteenth century downwards, was to reduce the Church into subservience and subjection to the Crown. Under colour of repressing Ultramontanism, protecting the Gallican liberties, and reforming abuses, the State succeeded in transferring to itself nearly the whole of the external dominion enjoyed by the hierarchy during the preceding ages.

VI.

THE *ecclesiastical courts* had acquired extensive powers from a very early period of history. The Emperor Constantine authorized the bishops to act as judges in matters affecting their clergy; and it was declared lawful for lay citizens to appeal in civil causes (not in criminal) to the episcopal tribunals; the sentences thus pronounced being enforced by the State. These provisions were gradually enlarged by successive enactments, until at length the administration of justice throughout the empire was concentrated in great measure in the hands of the clergy. By the Code of Justinian the bishops were constituted the legal guardians of orphans, widows, minors, lunatics, paupers, prisoners, and generally of all who were comprehended in the category of "*miserabiles personæ*." All testamentary and matrimonial questions—all matters relating to bankers, usurers, Jews, Lombards—everything involving contracts and engagements upon oath—all cases arising out of the Crusades—the management of hospitals and other charitable institutions—all charges of sacrilege, perjury, incontinence, and in short, all proceedings originating in human

delinquency or *sin*—were consigned in course of time to the judicial arbitration of the Church.*

This vast development of spiritual jurisdiction became a prolific source of abuse; and it was the work of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to curb and curtail it. An attempt had been made, indeed, by the feudal aristocracy, during the reign of St. Louis, to confine the competence of the episcopal courts to charges of heresy, usury, and matters concerning the sacrament of marriage.† But the reactionary movement acquired greater force in the time of Philippe de Valois, as appears from the account of a memorable conference held in the presence of that monarch in 1329, when the whole question of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction was argued between Pierre de Cugnières, Avocat-General in the Parliament, on behalf of the Crown, and the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Autun, as defenders of the Church.‡ De Cugnières contended that the spiritual and the temporal power have each a separate province; that the two jurisdictions cannot be exercised in conjunction; and that, consequently, the bishops ought to relinquish the judicial functions incidental to their rank as feudal lords, and restrict themselves to those belonging properly to the pastoral office. To this it was replied, by the Bishop of Autun, that although the two jurisdictions are distinct, they are by no means incompatible; but may be united in the same hands, whenever that arrangement may be judged conducive to the general welfare. He cited various instances from Scripture in support of this view. The discussion was kept up with spirit and ability on both sides. The king's advocate exhibited a catalogue of sixty-six gravamina, or articles in which he alleged that the ecclesiastical courts had exceeded their powers. The officials of the bishops, he said, asserted a right to take cognizance of causes relating to landed property, to the exclusion of the civil jurisdiction. They cited laymen to their bar even in personal actions, and if the parties declined to plead, they compelled them by means of excommunication

* Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. iii. cap. 87, 110. Fleury, *Instit. au Droit Ecclesiastique*, Pt. III. cap. 1.

† Matt. Paris, ad ann. 1247.

‡ Raynald., ad ann. 1329. Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xi. Etienne Pasquier, *Recherches*, tom. iii. cap. 33. Fleury, *H. E.*, Liv. xciv.

to submit to their illegal proceedings. "If a person excommunicated for debt fails to pay the sum required by the sentence, the fine is forthwith augmented, and the secular judge is enjoined, under spiritual censure, to enforce the payment by seizure of goods. If he demurs, he is pronounced excommunicate, and cannot obtain absolution except by satisfying the whole demand." Other articles complained that the bishops, in order to enhance their power, were in the habit of giving the clerical tonsure to persons manifestly disqualified ;—to children under age, to married men, to those of illegitimate birth, to the grossly ignorant, to many who sought the privileges of the Church merely for the sake of screening themselves from the just punishment of crime. The episcopal baillis and prévôts, designedly chosen from the clergy, incurred debt and practised every kind of extortion with impunity, since there was no means of bringing them to justice. These officers, whenever they chose to treat persons as excommunicate, rightly or wrongly, prevented all men from trading with them, working for them, or holding any sort of intercourse with them ; whence it often happened that the land remained uncultivated. It was a common case for twenty, thirty, forty, or more individuals to be brought up and fined in different amounts for the offence of having associated with those who lay under the ban of the Church. The Bishop of Autun manfully combated these charges upon various grounds ;—alleging the provisions of statute law, ancient custom, the permission of the Crown, the superiority of the clerical order in legal knowledge and general character. No immediate changes resulted from this remarkable debate. The king declared that he had no intention whatever to attack the acknowledged privileges of the clergy. The bishops assured him that all well-founded grievances should be redressed without delay ; and they were ultimately dismissed with an intimation that sufficient time would be allowed for the fulfilment of their promise, but that, in case of failure to observe it, the king would be compelled to take the affair into his own hands.*

From this date the aggressions of the civil power upon the

* "Quòd dominus Rex exspectaret usque ad festum Nativitatis Domini proximè venturum ; infra quem terminum, si prælati non emendassent

emendanda et corrigenda, dominus Rex apponeret tale remedium quod esset gratum Deo et populo."—See *Mémoires du Clerge*, tom. vi. p. 19.

spirituality became more and more frequent and determined; and in course of time all *matières profanes* were assigned to the sole cognizance of the royal courts. Gradually, by means of various subtle distinctions, such as that between "*délits communs*" and "*cas privilégiés*,"* the clergy were brought within the ordinary limits of secular authority. Laymen were forbidden to resort to the ecclesiastical judges; and the Crown assumed jurisdiction in causes affecting the temporalities of the Church, upon the ground that they constituted a beneficial interest which was subject to the control of the law of the land, like any other property.

It was not long before a decisive blow was aimed against the jurisdiction of the Church in France, by the claim advanced by the Crown, or rather by the Parliaments, to hold a tribunal of appeal from the judgments of the ecclesiastical courts. The institution of the "*appel comme d'abus*," as it is called—" *appellatio tanquàm ab abusu*"—subjected all judicial acts of the officers of the Church to the revision and correction of secular law. The invention of this expedient has been attributed to the redoubtable Pierre de Cugnieres; at all events it originated early in the fourteenth century, though a considerable time elapsed before it became general. The *appel comme d'abus*, in its most common acceptation, was a complaint preferred against the ecclesiastical judge, on the plea that he had exceeded or abused his legitimate powers. The appeal lay to the Grande Chambre of the Parliament in civil, and to the Chambre de la Tournelle in criminal, actions; its effect was that, when admitted by the court, the case was thereupon heard and adjudged afresh, such adjudication being final. The authority of Popes and Councils was alleged in justification of the practice; *e. g.* that of the great Lateran Council under Innocent III., which enacted, in its forty-second canon, that "as the laity are forbidden to usurp the rights of the clergy, so the clergy must take care not to intrude upon the privileges of the laity. Wherefore we prohibit all clerks from employing any pretext of ecclesiastical liberty as a means

* "*Delits communs*" were offences of a less serious kind, which were left to be dealt with by the Church courts. "*Cas privilégiés*" included all crimes attended by public scandal, such as

treason, homicide, "rapt," &c., with regard to which the secular judge claimed jurisdiction jointly with the ecclesiastical, and the former gave sentence in the last resort.

of enlarging their own power at the expense of the secular jurisdiction."

The *appel comme d'abus* was ultimately established as admissible against the Church courts in the four following cases:—

1. When the spiritual power had encroached upon the temporal jurisdiction.
2. When there was a manifest contravention of the ancient canons, the liberties of the Gallican Church, or the ecclesiastical constitutions received in the kingdom.
3. When the ecclesiastical judge had infringed any royal ordinance duly promulgated.
4. When a decision had been given contrary to the *arrêts* of the sovereign courts of Parliament.*

It was ruled, moreover, that the appeal could not be entertained unless the matter in question was of real importance and evident public interest; and further, that the abuse complained of must be patent and notorious. But these restrictions were disregarded in subsequent practice.† The right of appeal to the Parliaments was extended indefinitely to matters great and small, and that upon pretexts transparently frivolous; so that, instead of acting as a wholesome check on any inordinate stretch of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, its general tendency was to obstruct that necessary exercise of discipline without which Church authority is little more than a name. The clergy in their assemblies made repeated remonstrances on this subject to the crown, representing that the practice led to contempt and hatred of the spiritual jurisdiction, encouraged vice, shackled and thwarted the administration of things sacred, and overburdened the consciences of the secular judges.‡ They also prayed that the cases might be precisely specified, in which an appeal from spiritual to lay courts was held allowable; but the reply was always vague and evasive. They were reminded that circumstances might arise which were unforeseen and unprovided for; and that conflicts might occur in consequence between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. The French monarchs, it is true, gave injunctions from time to time to the officers of their courts to beware of transgressing the bounds of their legal competence in the matter

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. vii. p. 1542, et seqq. *Procès-verbaux des Assemblées du Clergé*, tom. i. p. 726.

† Richard, *Analyse des Conciles*, tom.

iii. p. 81.

‡ See the Cahier presented to Henry IV. by the Assembly of 1605, Article 26. *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. vi. p. 118.

of appeals; but practically, the *appel comme d'abus* became the favourite resource of all persons disaffected to the Church, for the purpose of defeating any attempt to put in force the regulations of her ancient discipline.

It was a disputed point, whether the *appel comme d'abus* had a "suspensive," or only a "devolutive," effect; that is, whether the execution of the sentence appealed against was suspended during the prosecution of the appeal, or whether it remained in force, and the case was merely transferred to the superior court for a fresh hearing. The general opinion was that with regard to sentences for the correction of manners and ordinary ecclesiastical discipline, the appeal had no suspensive force.*

It is to be observed that the *appel comme d'abus* was available reciprocally as a remedy against the *temporal* courts, in case of abuse of power or unlawful intrusion into the province of the Church. This is laid down by Pierre Pithou in his enumeration of the "liberties of the Gallican Church;" and De Marca refers to it as the constitutional method of obtaining redress for any encroachment of the civil power on the rights of the Church or of its ministers.† Instances are on record of its being exercised with full effect. An ecclesiastic, if cited before the temporal court for a matter not legally within its competence, might demand to have the case sent back to be tried before the bishop's official; and if this were refused, he was entitled to appeal, *comme d'abus*, to the Grande Chambre of the Parliament.

At the Council of Trent the *appel comme d'abus* was vehemently attacked by theologians of various nations, and was as pertinaciously defended by the ambassadors of Charles IX. of France. The result was that it was maintained in full vigour; and, indeed, it was not to be expected that the Crown, having once succeeded in establishing so effectual an engine for neutralizing the judicial action of the Church, should afterwards be induced to relinquish it. Accordingly, although the ancient ecclesiastical jurisdiction in France, like the rest of the mediæval organization, was swept away by the torrent of the great Revolu-

* Héricourt, *Loix Eccles. de France*, E., capp. 14, 28.

† P. Pithou, *Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*, Article 80. De Marca, *De Concord.*, Lib. iv. cap. 21, § 5.

tion, the usage of the *appel comme d'abus* has survived to our own times. Proceedings of this kind still take place occasionally before the Imperial Council of State.

In proportion as Feudalism declined, the French Crown assumed to itself all those rights, prerogatives, and emoluments connected with the Church, which had previously been enjoyed by the local seigneurs. The most important of these was the *droit de régale* (*jus regaliæ*), which gave to the lay suzerain the administration of the revenues of episcopal sees while they remained vacant, together with all the patronage belonging to them; though this latter was held to apply properly only to those benefices which had no cure of souls. The *régale* was a point on which the kings of France became especially jealous, and which they vindicated with the utmost energy on many memorable occasions. It seems to have been fully established in the time of Philippe le Bel, who gave the following explanation of it in a letter to the Bishop of Auxerre: "As in the case of the vacancy of a lay fief, it is legally held by the seigneur, together with its revenues; and this occupation continues, according to the universal custom of our realm, until another vassal succeeds, who may do feudal service in place of the former; so, during the vacancy of a cathedral church, we and our predecessors have taken possession both of the temporal jurisdiction and of the temporal property, the fruits of which belong to us for the time being. Nor is it only as to the property of bishops that we exercise this power; we dispose in like manner of the temporal jurisdiction and revenues appertaining to vacant prebends and dignities of all kinds." *

By a famous ordinance of Philippe de Valois, known as "the Philippine," the *droit de régale* was asserted still more dogmatically, and made to extend not only to benefices vacant *de facto*, but also to those which *ought* to be vacated *de jure*; *i.e.* those which were held without a legitimate canonical title.† This proceeding called forth strenuous remonstrances from Pope Benedict XII., as contrary to all principles of justice and ecclesiastical liberty. The same Pontiff protested against the misconduct of the royal officers; who, under shelter of the *régale*, were accustomed to

* De Marca, *De Concord.*, Lib. viii. cap. 22, § 6.

† Héricourt, *Loix Ecclesiastiques de France*, F. vi. No. 15.

waste, alienate, and destroy the temporal possessions of the Church, often damaging the vacant benefices seriously and permanently.* It is evident, indeed, that by wantonly prolonging a vacancy, an unscrupulous monarch might easily convert the *droit de régale* into an instrument of indefinite spoliation and oppression.

VII.

SUCH were some of the vicissitudes to which the Gallican Church was subjected, in its relations both to the Apostolic See and to the civil government, down to the middle of the fourteenth century. The great Schism of the West (A.D. 1378-1429) formed so critical an epoch in its history, and led ultimately to consequences so momentous, that it is necessary to examine it with some minuteness of detail.

This grave calamity is distinctly traceable to the ill-advised secession of the Popes to Avignon, in the person of Clement V. That Pontiff is commonly supposed to have obtained the tiara by means of a simoniacal contract with Philip the Fair, which bound him, among other articles, to take up his residence in France. But this account, which rests mainly on the authority of the Ghibelline historian Villani, has been partially discredited by more accurate researches in our own day; and it seems probable that the change of residence was made voluntarily, for the purpose of escaping from the violent contentions which were raging at the time at Rome between the rival Orsini and Colonna factions.† Be this as it may, the step was fatal to the independence of the Papal throne. Having once taken refuge on Cisalpine territory, Clement could not avoid acting with more than common deference to the wishes and interests of the King of France. This was notoriously his motive in the most important transactions of his reign—in the judicial pro-

* Raynald., *Annal.*, ad ann. 1337; Fleury, *H. E.*, Liv. xciv.

† See the interesting treatise of M. Rabanis, *Clément V. et Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1858. The author demonstrates it to be next to impossible that the Archbishop of Bordeaux (afterwards Clement V.) can have held a personal interview with Philip at S. Jean d'An-

gély, or elsewhere in that neighbourhood, at the date usually assigned for the compact between them. That Clement owed his election to Philip's influence, and that he became, as Pope, the subservient instrument of that monarch's purposes, are facts which admit of no question.

ceedings against the memory of Boniface VIII.,—in the iniquitous suppression of the Templars,—and in his support of the princes of Anjou in the Kingdom of Naples. Moreover (and it was upon this that subsequent events chiefly turned) a French Pope was naturally disposed to create French cardinals; and prelates of that nation accordingly figured almost exclusively in the promotions to the conclave during this period. Thus they formed in course of time a decided majority of the sacred college.

The luxury, pride, avarice, and tyranny of the Popes who sat at Avignon are proverbial in history.* The kings of France connived at their excesses, and pressed them to remain permanently in their new capital; obtaining the more readily, by this policy, Pontifical sanction for the exactions and usurpations which they themselves practised on the National Church. The general result was a lamentable degradation of the supreme spiritual authority. Protection and security was all that was afforded to the Pontiffs ostensibly; but their real condition for seventy years was one of splendid vassalage to the French Crown.

Bitter were the lamentations poured forth by the Romans over this “second Babylonish captivity,” and earnestly did they implore the successor of St. Peter to resume the natural and only legitimate seat of his primacy. Gregory XI., overcome by their importunities, returned to Rome in 1377,† and died there early in the following year, mournfully forecasting the misfortunes which were soon to fall upon the Church.

There were at that moment twenty-three Cardinals, of whom eighteen were Frenchmen. Of these, however, six had remained at Avignon, and one was absent in Tuscany; so that the actual conclave by which the Pope was to be chosen consisted of no more than sixteen members. Nevertheless, if the French had been united, they might have commanded the election; but they were divided by a jealousy against the Limousins, to which province three preceding Pontiffs had belonged. The conse-

* There were, however, some honourable exceptions, such as those of Innocent VI. and Urban V.

† Charles V. of France made extraordinary efforts to prevent his leaving Avignon. The Duke of Anjou, the

king's brother, was despatched at the last moment to join the French Cardinals in the intrigues by which they were labouring at all hazards to frustrate the Pope's purpose.

quence was that the minority of the French coalesced with the Italians, and secured a preponderance. Considerable pressure was also exercised on the conclave by the magistrates and citizens of Rome, who clamoured tumultuously for "a Roman Pope," or, at all events, for a native-born Italian. It was under this stress of circumstances that Bartolomeo Pregnano, a Neapolitan, Archbishop of Bari, was elevated to the Papal chair in April, 1378, and took the title of Urban VI. But after an interval of some months the French cardinals, anxious above all things to retain the Pontifical court in their own land, and irritated, moreover, by the tyrannical severity of Urban's government, retired to Fondi in the Kingdom of Naples, declared the former election void by reason of constraint and intimidation, and conferred the tiara upon Robert Cardinal of Geneva, who was immediately crowned under the name of Clement VII. A deplorable schism ensued. The King of France, after instituting a lengthened and rigorous inquiry at Rome, and holding repeated consultations with his prelates and the theologians of Paris, determined to support Clement, who was thenceforward recognised by the French as rightful Pope. He obtained afterwards, chiefly through French influence, the adhesion of Spain, Scotland, Savoy, and Sicily. The rest of Europe acknowledged the authority of Urban VI.

It was natural that Clement should fix his abode in proximity to the most powerful of the sovereigns who had embraced his cause. He established himself at Avignon, where he was surrounded by thirty-six cardinals, almost without exception French; and as it was necessary to provide these dignitaries with revenues befitting their rank, their claims became a burdensome tax on the ecclesiastical property of the realm. The Popes of Avignon had laid heavy hands on the endowments of the Gallican Church, even while they enjoyed the undivided allegiance of Christendom; but the evil was vastly intensified when their jurisdiction was confined to France and some few neighbouring countries. The system of disciplinary abuses was now carried to its most scandalous extreme. By means of reserves, expectatives, and dispensations, Clement accumulated all the higher preferments on his own devoted partizans; and the clergy were shamefully pillaged by multifarious devices in order to enrich the Pontifical exchequer. The oppressive impost

called annates, or the first-fruits of benefices, was largely augmented, and enforced with extortionate rigour.* It was assessed not only on "benefices consistoriaux," but on all preferments indiscriminately; and the demand was at last trebled in amount, the emoluments of three years being swallowed up in succession, instead of the first year's income only. By this proceeding incumbents were not unfrequently reduced to absolute want, and compelled to become vagabonds and mendicants.† Another exaction, that of the "decimes," or tenths, which was levied without mercy upon the entire temporalities of the Church, provoked a formidable resistance from the University of Paris.‡

It is impossible to describe adequately the profound perplexity, dismay, and confusion which arose from this protracted warfare between the rival vicars of Christ. With regard to the intrinsic merits of the dispute there was much to be pleaded on both sides; nor has the Church ever thought fit to decide the question authoritatively. It is obvious, however, that if either Pope had been canonically chosen, the other was a mere pretender; and the latter, in that case, was not only himself schismatical, but had involved all his adherents in the guilt and penalties of schism. The only alternative hypothesis—namely, that both Popes were alike uncanonical—was still more distressing; for if so, then the Catholic body possessed no legitimate visible head—a state of things which, according to the theology of that day, was so abnormal as to be almost subversive of its Divine constitution.

It was felt to be imperative that measures should be taken towards the removal of evils which threatened nothing less than the total disintegration of organized Christianity in the West; and the distinction of having inaugurated a practical movement to that end, which was substantially, if not completely, crowned with success, belongs without question to the Church of France.

* It appears that the "annatæ" were first imposed as a permanent tax on bishoprics and other "beneficia consistorialia" by Boniface IX. in 1392. The custom, however, was not new; the first year's revenue having been exacted by bishops and other dignitaries from the incumbents of benefices in their patronage from a much earlier period.

See Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, III., Lib. ii. cap. 58.

† See the contemporary *Chronique du Religieux de S. Denis*, Liv. ii. cap. 2. (Documens inédits sur l'histoire de France.) Also, J. Juvenal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI.*

‡ Du Boulai, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris*, tom. iv. p. 533.

The remedy proposed was that of appeal to a General Council, as the supreme tribunal of Christendom;—competent, should the necessity arise, to pass judgment even on the Pope himself. This is commonly quoted as one of the peculiar principles of Gallicanism; but in point of fact it is an original constitutional law of the Church Catholic. It was not contended, even by the strictest Gallicans, that the Church ought to be governed, under ordinary circumstances, by a succession of General Councils; but that such a legitimate method of final decision existed, and that the schism was an emergency which justified and necessitated its application. The Church possessed, by the charter of her Divine foundation, powers which had been granted for the express purpose of preserving her organic unity; and if she had hitherto forborne to exercise those powers under the existing calamity, it was all the more important that they should not be suffered to fall into further disuse and oblivion, while every day was adding to the inveteracy of the evils which they were designed to counteract.

The University of Paris—at this time the most celebrated school of theology in Europe—interposed, and laboured with indefatigable zeal to procure the reunion of the distracted Church. Its Chancellor was Pierre d'Ailly (Petrus de Alliaco), afterwards Cardinal and Bishop of Cambrai. Its leading divines were the illustrious Jean Gerson, who succeeded D'Ailly in the post of Chancellor, Nicolas de Clemangis, Gilles Deschamps, and Jean de Courtecuisse. The first movements of these energetic reformers were visited with severe censure, and even punishment, by the corrupt court of Charles VI. One of their body, a learned professor named Jean Rousse, was arrested and imprisoned by the Regent, the Duke of Anjou, merely for having suggested that the only effectual means of healing the schism was the convocation of a General Council. His colleagues obtained his release with difficulty, and on the express condition that they would henceforth support the Pope of Avignon, Clement VII.* So powerful were the ties of interest which attached the French monarchy to the Cisalpine Pope, that anything like scepticism as to Clement's legitimacy was treated as a serious crime. It was notified to the heads of

* *Chron. du Rel. de St. Denis*, Liv. ii. cap. 2.

the University that no further mention must be made of the election of another Pope, or the calling of a General Council, under pain of the King's signal displeasure.

D'Ailly and his brethren, nothing daunted, persevered in their endeavours to pave the way for a pacification; and eventually they wrung from the Government a reluctant permission to summon a special meeting of the whole academical body, to deliberate on the expedients for extinguishing the schism.

Consultations were held accordingly in the year 1394. The result was that the plans proposed reduced themselves to the three following:—1. The voluntary resignation of both Popes; after which the two colleges of cardinals might unite and proceed to a fresh election. 2. A compromise by means of arbitration; and 3. The convocation of a General Council, which, it was argued, would derive from the universal consent of the faithful irrefragable authority to pronounce judgment under the circumstances.* The first of these methods—the *voie de cession*—was that preferred by the University. Their views, having been embodied in an elaborate memorial admirably drawn up by Nicolas de Clemangis, one of the most accomplished scholars of his time, was presented by a deputation to the King. Its contents were likewise communicated to Pope Clement; who forthwith declaimed against it in full consistory as a “defamatory libel on the Holy See, saturated with the poison of calumny.” Such was the violence of his agitation that a fit of apoplexy ensued, of which he died on the 16th of September, 1394.

An attempt was now made to dissuade the cardinals of Avignon from proceeding to a fresh election; but in vain. Determined at all hazards to prolong the schismatical succession, they gave their votes to Pedro de Luna, a man of overbearing and obstinate temper, who assumed the title of Benedict XIII.

The labours of the Gallican theologians began at length to bear important fruit. In February, 1395, the king convoked an extraordinary assembly of prelates, clergy, princes, and nobles, at Paris, sufficient in numbers and dignity to represent the nation in Church and State, to discuss the proposals of the University as set forth in their Memorial. The Council decided in favour

* Crevier, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris*, tom. iii. p. 114.

of the “*voie de cession* ;” and, in consequence, a distinguished embassy, including the king’s uncles the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry, and his brother the Duke of Orleans, was dispatched to Avignon, to tender this unpalatable advice to Pope Benedict. But after a long course of illusory negotiation, it was found impossible to persuade the two antagonists to embrace this mode of settling their differences. Benedict met the remonstrances of the French court and clergy with coarse abuse and furious menaces ; and after a time, wearied by his perverseness and duplicity, the Gallican Church took the decisive step of withdrawing from his obedience.* The royal edict to that effect appeared on the 27th of July, 1398, and was registered by the Parliament on the 29th of August following. All the acts of Benedict were thereby pronounced null and void. Appeals to the Pope during the “*soustraction d’obédience*” were to be dealt with as if the pontifical chair were vacant ; they were to be heard by the Metropolitan, and in the last resort were to be carried before the Provincial Council. Various regulations were adopted for reviving the ancient forms of election,—for abolishing reservations and expective graces,—and for replacing the collation and institution to benefices in the hands of the lawful ordinaries. In short, a restoration was proclaimed of the primitive franchises and discipline of the Gallican Church.

But the existing crisis of affairs was by no means propitious to the execution of such wholesome measures, particularly as regards the re-establishment of free elections. It was found that the mere act of repudiating the authority of the Pope did not *ipso facto* reintegrate the Church in the enjoyment of her independence. On the contrary, the State took advantage of the interregnum to extend its sphere of intrusive action in the domain ecclesiastical ; and the clergy soon discovered that they had only exchanged the oppression of a spiritual despot for the still more questionable domination of the civil power. The nominees of the sovereign and his ministers monopolised the higher preferments ; the Courts Christian were impeded in the exercise of discipline ; the Parliaments assumed a wider jurisdiction ; and the power of the clerical order declined apace.

The “*subtraction of obedience*,” though adopted after mature deliberation, was the work of an extreme party, of the doctors of

* *Chron. de S. Denis*, Liv. xix. cap. 5.

the Sorbonne. It was viewed with misgiving and regret by the more moderate, that is the majority, of the national clergy, who saw that its inevitable tendency was to weaken and depress the Church in her relations with the civil Government. Pope Benedict had been besieged and imprisoned in his palace at Avignon by the royal forces; and this harsh treatment added to their dissatisfaction. So strong was the reaction that at length, through the influence of the Duke of Orleans, supported by D'Ailly, Gerson, and Clemangis, it was resolved to restore the allegiance of France to Benedict. This act was proclaimed by royal edict on the 30th of May, 1403; the Pope having solemnly engaged, as a preliminary condition, to resign in the event of the death, abdication, or deposition of his opponent.* He promised likewise to confirm all ecclesiastical appointments made during the interregnum; to summon without delay a Council of his obedience to treat for the termination of the schism; and to abide faithfully by the decision of that assembly. The Pope, however, violated these articles without scruple; fresh opposition was stirred up in consequence; and at a third great convocation of clergy (December 21, 1406) the decisive conclusion was arrived at that it was indispensably necessary to have recourse to a General Council for the reformation of the Church in its head and its members. This was followed up by a royal declaration to the effect that, if the unity of the Church were not restored by the Feast of the Ascension next ensuing, the kingdom of France would finally renounce both Popes, and assume a position of neutrality. Upon this the two popes opened a negotiation, ostensibly with a view to an accommodation by the method of cession; but their behaviour soon led to the conviction that they were secretly leagued together to prolong the schism. An act of inconceivable rashness on the part of Benedict, who launched a bull threatening the University and the whole realm with interdict and the king with deposition, produced a burst of vehement indignation in France; where, in

* *Chron. de S. Denis*, Liv. xxiv. cap. 5. These proceedings were not allowed to pass without censure in several quarters. The University of Toulouse addressed a strongly worded remonstrance to the king, urging that neither the State nor any national Council were entitled to sit in judgment on the

supreme Pontiff, or to legislate on matters affecting the general administration of the Church. An Œcumenical Council was the only authority competent to entertain such questions. Raynald., *Annal.* ad ann. 1403, tom. viii. p. 108.

August, 1408, the Government published a second withdrawal of obedience, abandoning the "voie de cession" as hopeless, and declaring itself in a state of neutrality until the meeting of the General Council, which had been convoked at Pisa by the two colleges of Cardinals for the spring of the following year.*

On this occasion the French Church carefully renewed its regulations of internal discipline to be observed during the suspension of intercourse with the Holy See. The different grades of appellate jurisdiction were precisely defined. From the Archdeacon the appeal lay to the Bishop; from the Bishop to the Metropolitan; from the Metropolitan to the Primate, or (where no primatial authority was recognized) to the Provincial Council. Each Metropolitan was to assemble the Council of his province every year; its duration was never to be less than a month. Free election was to be the rule for all dignities which by their nature or by ancient institution were elective. The election of Bishops to be confirmed by the Metropolitan; that of metropolitans by the Primate or the Provincial Council. Other articles prescribed the mode of proceeding as to dispensations, absolution from ecclesiastical censures, and the decision of cases specially reserved to the Pope. It was expressly announced that the spiritual courts would take the common law as their standard of jurisprudence in preference to the precepts of the Roman Chancery, wherever there was a divergence between the two codes.

These arrangements show that the first theologians of that age, however strongly attached to the Roman patriarchate and the Petrine primacy as traditional principles of government, did not deem them indispensable to the life, authority, and normal functions of the Church. Such, indeed, were the obvious lessons of this disastrous schism.

The authority of the forthcoming Council of Pisa lay open to serious question. In the first place, it was the received doctrine of that day that a General Council could be convoked only by the supreme Pontiff, and moreover, that he must preside over it either in person or by his legates. Neither Pope could do this while the schism existed; since the very purpose of resorting to

* *Chron. de S. Denis*, Liv. xxix, cap. 6. Du Boulay, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris*, tom. v. p. 158.

the Council was to determine between their conflicting pretensions, and to appoint a legitimate head of the Church. It had been argued, again, that under such circumstances the duty of convening the Council devolved upon the cardinals; but this led to a further difficulty; for, if it were doubtful who was the true Pope, it was doubtful likewise whether the cardinals were lawfully appointed, and whether they had the right to initiate such proceedings.* These problems, however, were met and solved in a masterly manner by such clear-sighted reasoners as D'Ailly and Gerson. The latter, in his famous treatise 'De auferibilitate Papæ,'† pointed out that the Church must of necessity possess the same power which belongs to every other corporate society, namely that of removing a chief officer who is unable or unworthy to execute his functions, and providing another in his place. "All positive laws," says Gerson, "are subject to modification according to the exigency of successive wants; and the present is one of those occasions when it is wiser to regard the spirit than the mere letter of the law, and to be governed by those primary sanctions which are unchangeable and divine."‡

D'Ailly, in like manner, demonstrated that in certain cases, one of which is that of a schism, rendering it difficult to determine between rival claimants of the Papacy, the ultimate appeal must unquestionably be to a General Council. That supreme tribunal, if the pretenders should obstinately refuse to resign, might depose them, and afterwards proceed to the election of a Pope who would be recognized throughout the Church.§

The Council met at Pisa on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1409, amid intense excitement throughout Christendom. The preponderance of the French Church on this great occasion

* Raynald., *Annal.*, tom. viii. c. 44.

† "Libellus de auferibilitate Papæ ab Ecclesiâ."—Gerson., *Opera*, tom. ii. p. 209 *et seqq.*

‡ "Non solum auctoritate Christi, sed etiam communi jure naturali præmissam potestatem habet corpus mysticum Ecclesiæ Dei. Patet, quia quodlibet corpus naturale naturaliter resistit suæ divisioni et distractioni, et si sit corpus animatum, naturaliter congregat omnia membra omnesque vires suas ad conservandam suam unitatem, et repellendam suam divisionem; simili quoque modo et quodlibet corpus civile, seu

civilis communitas, vel politia rite ordinata. Ideoque corpus spirituale seu mysticum Ecclesiæ Christianæ, quod ordinatissimè compositum est, simili jure uti poterit ad suam unitatem conservandam et quamlibet schismaticam divisionem repellendam, tanquam suæ ordinationis destructivam Jura positiva non possunt ab Ecclesiâ absolute tollere illam potestatem quæ ei competit divino et naturali jure."—Gerson, *Opp.*, tom. ii. p. 112. (Edit. Ellies Dupin. Antwerp, 1706.)

§ Petr. de Alliaco, *De Eccles. et Concil. General. Auctoritate*, Pt. III. cap. 4.

was manifest and irresistible. It was represented by eight cardinals, the titular Patriarch of Alexandria, Simon de Cramault, the Metropolitans of Lyons, Bourges, Toulouse, Tours, Narbonne, and Vienne,—thirty bishops present in person, and the proctors of forty-six others who were unable to attend,—a vast multitude of abbots, canons, heads of orders, and other dignitaries, together with deputations from the Universities of Paris, Orleans, Angers, Toulouse, and Montpellier.

Following the course indicated by the Parisian doctors, the Synod proclaimed, in its 14th session, that it represented the Church Universal, and had authority to decide the questions of the union of the Church and of the schism. It next proceeded in due form to depose Popes Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., as schismatical, heretical, perjured and incorrigible; released all Christians from the obligation to obey them; and declared the Holy See to be vacant. The election of a new Pope followed immediately. The Cardinals entered the Conclave on the 15th of June, each having previously signed an agreement which pledged him, in case he should be chosen, to continue the Council until it should have effected a substantial reformation. The choice fell upon the Cardinal of Milan, Peter of Candia, who took the title of Alexander V. The new Pontiff engaged at his election to continue the Council of Pisa for the avowed purpose of dealing with the crucial question of the reformation of the Church. Ultimately, however, he prorogued that assembly for three years, postponing the project of reform until it should resume its labours. Alexander held the Papal chair scarcely a year, and was succeeded, in May, 1410, by Balthazar Cossa, under the name of John XXIII. It was under the presidency of this pontiff that the celebrated Council of Constance, styled the Sixteenth Œcumenical, commenced its sittings on the 5th of November, 1414.

The master-spirit of this assembly was Jean Gerson, now Chancellor of the University of Paris; who impressed upon it, by force of character as well as of argument, those irrefragable views of ecclesiastical polity which for so many years he had energetically laboured to establish. A large part of Gerson's works is occupied by an elaborate exposition of the rights and functions of Œcumenical Councils. This was necessary under the circumstances of the time; for the expedient which he

advocated, notwithstanding the well-known practice of the Church in earlier ages, was strange to the existing generation; it was of a tentative character, and had somewhat the air of being a contrivance *pro re natâ*.

"It may be asked," writes Gerson to his friend Cardinal D'Ailly, immediately before the opening of the Synod, "it may be asked whether this Council is above the Pope.* I reply, certainly it is. It is superior to the Pope in authority, superior in dignity, superior in office. From the decisions of such a Council there is no appeal. Such a Council has power to enact new laws, and to abrogate existing and ancient laws. The constitutions and decrees of such a Council are incapable of being changed or dispensed with by any power inferior to itself. The Pope cannot, and never could, dispense with the sacred canons framed by a General Council,† unless the Council itself, for some weighty reason, should specially authorize him to do so. The Pope cannot alter, nor even interpret, the acts of the Council, much less can he dispense with them; since they are like the Gospels of Christ, over which the Pope has no jurisdiction whatever. Let the Catholic Church take heed above all things never to concede to the Pope, under any pretext, the power of dispensing with the canons of a General Council, or even of altering or interpreting them; this ought to be done solely by another council, to be convoked from time to time for the reformation of the Church. For it is plain as daylight that the greater part of what was done and ordained by the four great Œcumenical Councils, and others subsequent, has been almost annihilated and cast into oblivion by the growing avarice of Popes, cardinals, and prelates; by means of papal reservations, the iniquitous practices of the Apostolic Chamber and chancery, by corrupt dispensations, indulgences, and the office of the "Penitentiary."

* Bellarmine (*De Concil. Auct.*, Lib. ii.) asserts that the vexed question of the relative authority of Popes and Councils first arose at the time of the Council of Pisa, implying, of course, that it was one of the pestilent fruits of the great schism. But this is mere misrepresentation. See the conclusive testimonies collected on the subject by J. de Launoï, in his epistle ad Christophorum Fauvæum (Laun., *Epist.*, Pars I^{ma}.)

† This position is controverted by De Marca, who lays down as a fundamental principle, "Papam solvere posse et dispensare validè et licitè à canonibus Conciliorum Generalium, etiam sine causâ; dummodo hæc dispensatio non tendat ad labefactandum Ecclesiæ statum (*De Concord.*, Prolegomena, and *ib.* Lib. iii. capp. 14, 15). Gerson, however, is in this instance the more correct exponent of Gallican doctrine.

“The first object of the Council,” he continues, “is the election of one universal and unquestioned Pastor, approved by the whole Church; and, in the next place, there must be made a certain limitation and modification of the power of the said pastor; which power is at present excessive, and has grievously impaired and damaged the rights of other prelates.”*

The same maxims were asserted, but in more unmeasured language, by Gerson's colleagues, the doctors deputed to the Council by the University of Paris. “The Church militant,” they observed, “is more necessary than the Pope; for men can be saved without the Pope, whereas beyond the Church there is no salvation. The Church is better than the Pope; because the Pope is made for the Church; now, as Aristotle teaches, the end is superior to the means. The Church is more honourable than the Pope; for Christ multiplies upon her gifts and graces without number, which cannot be said of the person of the Pope. The Church is stronger than the Pope; since the gates of hell, that is the vices and heresies of mankind, have never prevailed against her; whereas they have often prevailed against the Pope. The Church is more steadfast in the faith than the Pope; for the Pope has sometimes departed from the faith, which can never be the case with the universal Church. The Pope receives from the Church the trust of sovereign authority; for he derives it through the ministry of those who elect him. It follows that the power which belongs *actually* to the Pope belongs *habitually* to the universal Church. The Church lawfully assembled can in certain cases arraign, condemn, and even depose the Pope; because, since the Pope acquires his power from the Church, the Church can deprive him of it, should it be abused. The Church, represented by a General Council, has more authority than the Pope, because the Council can frame decrees which the Pope is bound to observe. Hence St. Gregory declared that he would not believe the Gospels unless he were determined to such belief by the authority and witness of the Church.” The Parisian divines affirmed in conclusion that the Church could not take any more effectual step towards its own thorough reformation than to prescribe the regular con-

* Gerson, “De modis uniendi et reformandi Ecclesiam,” in Von der Hardt, *Concil. Constant.*, tom. ii, Pt. v.

tinuation of General Councils ; at the same time by no means omitting the due celebration of *Provincial Councils*.*

The strong predominance of Gallican opinion at Constance found expression in the well-known decrees passed by the Council in its fourth and fifth sessions, in spite of vehement opposition from the cardinals and bishops of the Italian "nation."

"This holy Synod of Constance, being a General Council lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, and representing the Church militant, has received immediately from Jesus Christ a power to which all persons of whatever rank and dignity, not excepting the Pope himself, are bound to submit in those matters which concern the faith, the extirpation of the existing schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and its members."†

"Whosoever, be his dignity what it may, without excepting the Pope, shall obstinately refuse to obey the statutes, ordinances, and precepts of the present Council, or of any other General Council lawfully assembled, shall be subjected, unless he repent, to proportionate penance, and punished according to his deserts, recourse being had, if necessary, to the assistance of the secular arm."

By other articles it was declared that the Council could not be transferred or dissolved without its own consent: and all the ecclesiastical acts of John XXIII., from the day of his flight from Constance, were pronounced null and void. It was likewise enacted that a second Ecumenical Council should be held five years after the dissolution of the present; another at the expiration of seven years after the second, and thenceforward one at the interval of every ten years.

Such was the first synodical definition made by the Western Church as to the relative powers and jurisdiction of the Pope

* See "Parisiensium Conclusiones," in Von der Hardt, tom. ii. Pt. 10.

† In some MSS. the words "in his quæ pertinent ad Fidem" are wanting; others do not contain the clause "ac generalem reformationem Ecclesiæ Dei in capite et in membris." This fact was taken advantage of by Emmanuel Schelstrate, librarian of the Vatican, in his edition of the Acts of the Council of Constance, as indicating that those passages had been fraudulently interpolated; and he accuses the Fathers of Basle of fabricating them for the sake

of establishing more completely the subjection of the Pope to the Council. But the charge is unfounded. In many copies, some of them of contemporary date, the decree appears precisely as it here stands; and *all* the records of the following session, in which it was discussed and enacted a second time, concur in relating it in the same exact terms. Cf. Bossuet, *Defens. Declarat. Cl. Gall.*, Pt. I. Lib. v. capp. 3, 4. Maimbourg, *Traité Historique des Prerog. de l'Egl. de Rome*, cap. 23. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. cii. 175.

and a General Council. The position of affairs at that crisis rendered such an utterance needful and unavoidable; but it cannot be denied that an element of strife was thus introduced, which developed step by step into a series of calamitous results.

From this moment may be dated the formal divergence of the Cisalpine or Gallican from the Ultramontane theology. Every ingenious device has been exhausted by the latter school in order to evade and nullify the force of these memorable decrees of Constance.* But the attempt is in no slight degree embarrassing. For, on the one hand, it would be suicidal to deny the authority of the Council, because the deposition of John XXIII., the election of Martin V., and the succession of subsequent Popes, would thereby be invalidated. Yet, on the other, these acts of the fourth and fifth sessions, if taken in their widest sense, are felt to be fatal to the theory of the Pope's absolute monarchy. Various arguments have been advanced to meet the difficulty. It is alleged that the Council did not intend to lay down a theological truth of universal obligation, but only to assert a rule of discipline applicable to abnormal circumstances, such as prevailed during the schism. It is obvious, however, that the Fathers of Constance go further than this; they predicate of "any other General Council lawfully assembled" the same authority, legislative and judicial, which they claimed for their own tribunal then sitting. And, moreover, among the famous articles of reformation which were adopted in their fortieth session (Oct. 30, 1417), and which the Pope elect engaged to propose for consideration at the meeting of the Council next ensuing, was one (art. 13) entitled "*Propter quæ et quomodo Papa possit corrigi et deponi.*"† Whence it is clear that the possibility was contemplated of circumstances which might compel the Church again to exercise its juridical power over the Pope, as it had done on the late occasions. This seems decisive as to the mind and purpose of those who framed the decrees of Constance.

But it is asserted, again, that the obnoxious definitions were never confirmed by the Pope, and consequently have no canonical authority. Martin V., who was elected in November, 1417,

* The most forcible argument against them, however, is one which cannot be employed by Ultramontanes consistently with their principles, namely, that the

Council of Constance was *not* Œcumenical, but only a synod of the Western Patriarchate, or Roman obedience.

† Von der Hardt, tom. iv. p. 1449.

and presided in the four concluding sessions of the Council, expressed his approval in general terms of all its acts which had been passed "conciliariter;"* but Bellarmine and others contend that the particular acts in question were not such, inasmuch as they were not preceded by full and mature synodical discussion. They therefore consider that the acts referred to in the bull of confirmation were those only by which the Council condemned the heresies of Wickliff and John Huss.

It will be allowed, however, that among the conciliar acts which were confirmed by Martin V., that of the deposition of John XXIII., his predecessor, must be included; for, unless that was a canonical proceeding, he himself was not the lawful occupant of the Apostolic See. Yet that act demonstrated the supremacy of a General Council over the Pope; and that not over a doubtful Pope, but over one acknowledged by the Council itself to be the true and rightful successor of Peter. Implicitly, therefore, Martin confirmed the doctrine asserted by the Council, even supposing that he did not expressly confirm the definitions of the fourth and fifth sessions.

This argument was pressed against him with conclusive effect by Gerson in his treatise on the right of appeal from the Pope to a General Council. "If it be not lawful," he says, "to appeal from the individual Pope to a Council which represents the whole Church Catholic, then such a Council is not the supreme tribunal of the Church; but if the Council is not possessed of such sovereign jurisdiction, then the Council of Constance had no right to depose John XXIII.; consequently he is still the legitimate Pope, and his Holiness Martin V., in that case, is no more than a pretender."†

Upon the whole, the language of Pope Martin, both on the occasion above referred to, and in his bull of February 22, 1418, must be held to signify the assent of that Pontiff to all doctrinal definitions made at Constance, including those which have since been so warmly controverted. Nor does it appear, after all, on a dispassionate view of the case, that anything is propounded

* See the Pope's reply to the ambassadors of the king of Poland. Von der Hardt, tom. iv. p. 1549. Lenfant, *H. du C. de Constance*, tom. ii. p. 609. The meaning of the word "conciliariter" has been much contested. I cannot doubt that Edm. Richer's

opinion is the right one, that it implies "in full Council," "in a regular session."—Richer, *Hist. Concil. Gen.*, tom. ii. p. 254. See also Ant. Arnauld., *Œuvres*, tom. x. p. 728.

† Gerson, *Opp*, tom. ii. p. 306.

in those definitions which is either beyond or beside the immemorial tradition of the Church. Was it a novel doctrine, that an Œcumenical Council has authority to make laws for the whole Christian community, and that the Pope, more directly than any other individual, is bound to conform to them, to maintain their integrity, and to enforce their observance? Had not this truth been acknowledged most emphatically by the Popes themselves for ages anterior to the Council of Constance? Do not their official professions and protestations on this subject occupy page after page in the collected code of ecclesiastical jurisprudence? The decrees of Constance, fairly construed, amount to no more than this, that it is obligatory on the Pope to obey the canons of Œcumenical Councils. Why should such a declaration be less acceptable to Popes of the fifteenth century than it was to those of the fifth? Why should Martin and Eugenius hesitate to sanction it, while it is endorsed by the concurrent testimony of their predecessors of happy memory, Zosimus, Boniface, Gelasius, S. Leo, S. Gregory, Leo IV., and many others?

But although the doctrine of the supremacy of General Councils, thus authoritatively proclaimed, is of the deepest importance as a rule of ecclesiastical polity, De Marca and other authors warn us against the mistake of supposing that the so-called "liberties of the Gallican Church" consist wholly, or even chiefly, in the maintenance of this abstract principle.* The true liberty of the Church, whether in France or elsewhere, lies in its being governed in conformity with the ancient canons, and with those laws which from time to time are enacted synodically, in accordance with the original principles of its constitution.

In pursuance of the arrangement made at Constance, a Council was convened at Pavia in 1423; but after a few weeks it was transferred to Sienna, and thence subsequently to Basle. Eugenius IV., who succeeded Martin, apprehending probably that this assembly, if permitted to proceed independently, would follow in the track of that of Constance, and apply itself with indiscreet zeal to the work of reform, attempted to dissolve it, and proposed that it should meet a year later at Bologna, where it would have been in great measure under his own dictation. This led to a rupture between the Pope and the Council; and

* De Marca, *De Concord.*, Lib. iii. cap. 7, §§ 1, 2.

years of confused strife ensued (into the details of which it is unnecessary to enter) totally frustrating the measures so urgently required for the purification of the Church.

The position assumed by the Gallican Church at this juncture was peculiar, and in some respects questionable. It declared decidedly in favour of the Council of Basle; many French prelates repaired thither, and ambassadors were sent by the King, Charles VII., to Pope Eugenius, to beseech him to support the authority of the Synod, and to protest against its dissolution. The Fathers stood firm at their post, appealing to the principles solemnly asserted at Constance, that the Pope is bound in certain specified cases to submit to an Œcumenical Council, and that the latter cannot be translated, prorogued, or dissolved, without its own consent.* The gift of infallibility, they affirmed, resides in the collective Church. It does not belong to the Popes, several of whom have erred concerning the Faith. The Church alone has authority to enact laws which are binding on the whole body of the faithful. Now, the authority of General Councils is identical with that of the Church. This was expressly determined by the Council of Constance, and acknowledged by Pope Martin V. The Pope is the ministerial

* One of the chief authorities for the proceedings of the Council of Basle is Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (afterwards Pope Pius II.), who acted as its secretary and amanuensis. His view of the relation of the Pope to the Church was at this time decidedly of the Gallican type. "The Pope," he says, "though called the head of the Church, cannot stand in the same relation to the ecclesiastical body as a man's head does to the natural body, otherwise it would follow that, as when the head is severed, the body is instantly deprived of life, so when the Pope expires, the Church is extinguished likewise, which were absurd. Whatever others may believe," he continues, "I cannot agree with those who hold the Pope to be the head of the Church, except in the sense of its ministerial head; for we read that Christ is the Head of the Church, not the Pope; it is [He who is the true, unchangeable, perpetual, and eternal Head. The Roman Pontiff is no more than the Vicar (locum tenens) of the true Head; but the

Church is the body of Christ himself, of which even the Pope is but a member. Moreover, he is the Vicar of Christ, not for the destruction, but for the edification of the Church, which is His body. Wherefore, if he should prove hurtful and pernicious, he may be deposed, for he does not fulfil the end for which he was instituted."—Æn. Sylv., *Comment. de Gestis Basiliens. Concil.*, Lib. i. Subsequently, however, when elevated to the Pontifical chair, Pius II. saw reason to discard these and other cognate sentiments of his earlier days, and even to retract them in a formal document. See the "*Retractatio Pii Secundi*," in Guimier and Pinsson, *Pragm. Sanct. et Concordat.*, p. 841 *et seq.* The whole case between the Councils of Constance and Basle, and Popes Martin and Eugenius, is powerfully discussed by the Archbishop of Palermo in his elaborate Treatise, *Panormitanus de Concilio Basiliensi*, printed by Guimier and Pinsson, *Pragm. Sanct. et Concordat.*, p. 849.

head of the Church, but he is not its absolute sovereign ; on the contrary, facts prove that he is subject to the jurisdiction of the Church ; for well-known instances are on record of Popes being deposed on the score of erroneous doctrine and immoral life, whereas no Pope has ever attempted to condemn or excommunicate the Church. Both the Pope and the Church have received authority to bind and loose ; but the Church has practically exerted that authority against the Pope, whereas the latter has never ventured to take any such step against the Church. In fine, the words of Christ himself are decisive of the question—"If any man neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto you as a heathen man and a publican." This injunction was addressed to St. Peter equally with the rest of the disciples.*

The Council proceeded to cite Eugenius by a formal monition to appear in person at Basle ; and on his failing to comply, they signified that on the expiration of a further interval of sixty days, ulterior means would be put in force against him. Their firmness, added to the pressing solicitations of the Emperor Sigismund, at length induced the Pope to yield. He reconciled himself with the Council in December, 1433 ; acknowledged that it had been legitimately convoked ; approved its proceedings up to that date ; and cancelled the act by which he had pronounced its dissolution.†

Elated by this triumph, the Basilian fathers commenced in earnest the task of church reform, and passed several decrees of a character vexatious to the Pope, particularly one for the total abolition of annates. A second breach was the consequence. Eugenius, under pretence of furthering the negotiation then pending for the reunion of the Greek and Latin branches of the Church, published in 1437 a bull dissolving the Council of Basle, and summoning another to meet at Ferrara. The assembly at Basle retorted by declaring the Pope contumacious, and suspending him from the exercise of all authority. Both parties proceeded eventually to the last extremities. The Council, after proclaiming afresh, as "Catholic verities," that a General Council has power over the Pope, and cannot be transferred or dissolved but by its own act, passed a definitive

* See the synodical reply of the Fathers of Basle to the Pope's legates in Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xii.

† Raynald, *Ann.*, tom. ix. p. 164.

sentence in its thirty-fourth session (June 25, 1439) deposing Eugenius from the Papal throne. The Pope retaliated by stigmatizing the fathers of Basle as schismatical and heretical, cancelling their acts, and excommunicating their president, the Cardinal Archbishop of Arles.*

Meanwhile an energetic and independent line of action was adopted by the government in France. The Crown, in concert with the heads of the Church, availed itself of a train of events which had so seriously damaged the prestige of the Papacy, to make a decisive advance in the path of practical reform, and to establish the long-cherished Gallican privileges on a secure basis. For this purpose Charles VII. assembled a great National Council at Bourges, in July, 1438, at which he presided in person, surrounded by the princes of his family, and by all the most eminent dignitaries spiritual and temporal; and here was promulgated the memorable ordinance known as the "Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges."

The French Church, it must be observed, did not recognise the deposition of Pope Eugenius, but adhered to his obedience, rejecting Felix V., whom the Council of Basle elected to succeed him, as a pretender. It continued, nevertheless, to support the Council, and to assert its supreme legislative authority. Hence there arises a considerable difficulty *in limine* as to the character of the proceedings at Bourges. For the deposition of Eugenius was either a rightful and valid exercise of conciliar authority, or it was not. If it was not—if the Council had wrongfully and uncanonically condemned the successor of Peter—how could it be infallible? and why should its legislation in other particulars be indisputable? On the other hand, if the deposition was a valid one, with what consistency could the French continue to regard Eugenius as their legitimate pastor? It was a knotty dilemma.

The position, however, though logically open to objections, was not without its practical advantages. For, since France maintained a good understanding with both the contending parties, both found it conducive to their interest to send deputations to the Council of Bourges; Pope Eugenius, with

* The Ultramontane arguments against the validity of the proceedings at Basle are to be found at length in Cardinal Torquemada's *Summa de Ecclesiâ*, from

which an extract is given by Raynald, ad ann. 1432. Torquemada (or De Turrecremata) was the Pope's "theologian" at the Council.

a view to obtain its support for the rival council which he had opened at Ferrara; the fathers of Basle, in order to make known their decrees, which, as agreeing with the received doctrine of Gallican theologians, would, it was hoped, meet with a cordial welcome throughout France. The assembly at Bourges did not fail to profit by these exceptional circumstances. It accepted the decrees of Basle, yet not absolutely, but after critical examination, and with certain modifications;—a course which, by implication, asserted a right to legislate for the concerns of the French Church even independently of a General Council acknowledged to be orthodox. The following explanation of this proceeding was inserted in the preamble of the celebrated statute finally agreed upon by the authorities at Bourges. It is there stated that this policy was adopted “not from any hesitation as to the authority of the Council of Basle to enact and promulgate ecclesiastical decrees, but because it was judged advisable to adapt those decrees to the usages, circumstances, and requirements of the French realm and nation.”* So that it appears, on the whole, that while the French professed great zeal on this occasion for the dogma of the superiority of a General Council over the Pope, the principle practically illustrated at Bourges was that of the supremacy of a *National* Council over every other ecclesiastical authority.† Such were the anomalies which arose out of the strange necessities of the time.

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges‡ embraces twenty-three articles. The first treats of the authority of General Councils, and of the time and manner of convening and celebrating them. The second relates to ecclesiastical elections, which are enjoined to be made hereafter in strict accordance with the canons, by the cathedral, collegiate, and conventual chapters.§ Reserves,

* “Non hæsitazione potestatis et auctoritatis condentis et promulgantis, scilicet ipsius sacræ Basiliensis Synodi, sed quatenus commoditatibus, temporibus, et moribus regionum et personarum sæpe factorum nostrorum Regni et Delphinatus congruere convenireque congruè jureque conspexerunt.”

† “Tantâ libertate in recipiendis, rejiciendis, truncandis, ampliandis Basiliensium placitis usi sunt, ut patentissimè se etiam judices Conciliorum Generalium quale Basiliense præ se ferebant, constituerint.”—Spondanus, ad ann. 1438.

‡ *Ordonnances des Rois*, tom. xiii. p. 267.

§ Sir James Stephen, in one of his *Lectures on the History of France* (vol. i. p. 405, 3rd Edit.), has fallen into the curious mistake of supposing that the Pragmatic Sanction legalised the nomination by the Crown to the bishoprics and other Church dignities; and he describes this as constituting the “Gallican liberties.” On the contrary, that edict restored, in distinct terms, “the canonical elections to all metropolitan, cathedral, collegiate, and conventual churches, according to the provisions of

annates, and "expective graces," are abolished; the rights of patrons are to be respected, provided their nominees be graduates of the Universities, and otherwise well qualified. The Pope retains only a veto in case of unfitness or uncanonical election, and the nomination to benefices "in curiâ vacantia," *i. e.*, of which the incumbents may happen to die at Rome, or within two days' journey of the Pontifical residence. The King and other princes may occasionally *recommend* or *request* the promotion of persons of special merit, but without threats or violent pressure of any kind.*

Other articles regulate the order of ecclesiastical appeals, which, with the exception of the "causæ majores" specified by law, and those relating to the elections in cathedral and conventual churches, are henceforth to be decided on the spot by the ordinary judges; appeals are to be carried in all cases to the court immediately superior; no case to be referred to the Pope "omisso medio," *i. e.*, without passing through the intermediate tribunals. The remaining clauses consist of regulations for the performance of Divine service, and various matters of discipline.

The reader will remember that Pope Eugenius, on the occasion of his temporary reconciliation with the Council of Basle in 1433, expressed his approbation of all its synodal acts up to that date; and this sanction of their validity is held by Gallicans to extend to the period of the second and final rupture in 1437.† It follows that the provisions of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, so far as they coincide with the decrees of Basle prior to 1437, were authorized by the Holy See; and this includes them all with two exceptions.‡

the common law." It was this right of *canonical election* that formed the keystone of the "liberty" of the Gallican Church; the practice of Royal nomination was a contravention, evasion, and abuse of that invaluable franchise. In order to obtain a statutable right to nominate the prelates of the realm, the Crown was obliged to *abolish* the Pragmatic Sanction, which was replaced by the Concordat of Bologna.

* "Nec credit ipsa congregatio Bituricensis fore reprehensibile, si Rex et principes regni sui (cessantibus tamen omnibus comminationibus et quibuslibet violentiis) aliquando utantur precibus benignis atque benevolis pro personis

benè meritis et zelantibus bonum Reipublicæ, regni, et Delphinatûs."

† *Continuat, de Fleury, Hist. Eccles.*, Liv. 106, §§ 83 et seqq.

‡ Ellies-Dupin, *Hist. Eccles. Cent. XVI.*, Liv. i. cap. 1. The two exceptions were the article on collations to benefices, and that on the hearing of ecclesiastical causes. Eugenius, in his bull "Moyses," dated at Florence in 1439, annuls all the proceedings at Basle subsequent to the translation of the Council, and inveighs with special severity against the three "Catholic verities" above mentioned, alleging that they are based on a misinterpretation and perversion of the decrees of

The Pragmatic Sanction was registered by the Parliament of Paris on the 13th of July, 1439; becoming thereby part of the statute law of France. Its publication caused universal satisfaction throughout the kingdom. At Rome, on the other hand, it was indignantly censured and resolutely opposed. Eugenius IV. vainly strove to obtain the King's consent to an alteration of some of its details. Nicolas V. protested against it without effect; but the superior genius and subtle measures of Pius II. were more successful. This Pontiff denounced the Pragmatic at the Council of Mantua in 1460, as "a blot which disfigured the Church of France; a decree which no Œcumenical Council would have passed, nor any Pope have confirmed; a principle of confusion in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Since it had been in force, the laity had become the masters and judges of the clergy; the power of the spiritual sword could no longer be exerted except at the good pleasure of the secular authority. The Roman Pontiff, whose diocese embraced the world, whose jurisdiction is not bounded even by the ocean, possessed only such extent of power in France as the Parliament might see fit to allow him." The ambassadors of Charles VII., however, reminded his Holiness that the Pragmatic Sanction was founded on the canons of Constance and Basle, which had been ratified by his predecessors; and when the Pope proceeded to threaten France with an interdict, and to prohibit all appeal from his decisions to a future council,* the King caused his procureur-general, Jean Dauvet, to publish an official protest against these acts of violence, concluding with a solemn appeal to the judgment of the Church Catholic assembled by representation. While awaiting that event, Charles declared himself resolved to uphold the laws and regulations which had been sanctioned by previous Councils.†

Louis XI., urged by alternate menaces, entreaties, and flattery from Rome, revoked the Pragmatic Sanction shortly after his accession. The step accorded well with his own arbitrary temper; for he could not endure the privilege of free election

Constance. He omits, however, to specify what is the true meaning of those decrees; merely observing that they were passed during the schism, and by one only out of the three "obediencies," after the departure of John

XXIII. — Raynald., *Ann.*, tom. ix. p. 316.

* By the famous Constitution "Execrabilis."—Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiii. p. 1801.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. cxi. § 147.

by the cathedral and monastic chapters; nor was he less jealous of the influence exerted, under the shelter of that privilege, by the high feudal nobility in the disposal of Church preferment. He seems to have expected, moreover, that while ostensibly conceding the right of patronage to the Apostolic See, he should be able to retain the real power in his own hands. The event disappointed his calculations. No sooner was the decree of Bourges rescinded, than the Pope resumed and enforced his claim to the provision of benefices in France. Simony, and the whole train of concomitant abuses, reappeared more scandalously than ever; and Louis found himself despised by his subjects as the dupe of Papal artifice.

The Parliamentary Courts, meanwhile, assumed a determined attitude in defence of the right of election guaranteed by the Pragmatic Sanction. They pronounced the abolition of that act illegal, and treated it as null and void; they insisted on their own authority in entertaining appeals against ecclesiastical abuses; they eagerly supported any one who showed a disposition to withstand the pretensions of Rome in the matter of patronage. The king, smarting under the trickery of the Pope, made no attempt to restrain them in this line of conduct; and the result was that the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction was never fully executed, having never been legalized by the forms of the Constitution. On the other hand, the Popes so far maintained the advantage they had extorted from Louis, that the ancient franchise of the Church as to elections became virtually extinct in France.*

Things remained in this unsettled state during the reigns of Louis XI., Charles VIII., and Louis XII. The latter prince, on coming to the throne, published an edict re-establishing the Pragmatic Sanction;† and this step, added to his ambitious enterprises in Italy, brought him into hostile collision with Pope Julius II. The king, unwilling to make war on the head of the Church without some semblance of ecclesiastical sanction, convoked a Council at Tours in September, 1510, and consulted the clergy on a series of questions arising out of the disturbed state of his relations with Rome. They decided, in accordance with the known views and wishes of the sovereign, that it is lawful

* Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II., Lib. ii. cap. xxxiii. 8.

† *Ibid.*, Lib. i. cap. 45.

for an independent prince, if unjustly attacked, to defend himself against the Pope by force of arms—to withdraw for a time from his obedience—to take possession of the territory of the Church, not with the purpose of retaining it, but as a temporary measure of self-protection—and to resist the pretensions of the Pontiff to powers not rightfully belonging to him. Citations to appear at Rome might, under such circumstances, be safely disregarded; as also Papal censures, which would be null and void. If the emergency should arise, the Council added, the king ought to be governed by the ancient principles of ecclesiastical law, as confirmed and re-enacted by the Pragmatic Sanction.*

The Gallican clergy sent a deputation to Pope Julius on this occasion, to entreat him to adopt a more conciliatory policy towards the princes of Christendom; and they determined, in case their advice should be fruitless, to demand the convocation of a General Council, to take cognizance of the Pope's conduct, and prescribe the measures necessary for the guidance and welfare of the Church.

An ecclesiastical congress, calling itself a Council-General, but altogether unworthy of that august title, was held, in fact, in the following year at Pisa, under the auspices of the King of France and the Emperor Maximilian. The Pope refused to appear there, and convoked a rival synod at Rome, summoning the cardinals who had authorized the meeting at Pisa to present themselves at his court within sixty days. On the expiration of this term he publicly excommunicated them, degraded them from their dignity, and deprived them of their preferments.

Thus the Western Church once more exhibited the spectacle of a "house divided against itself," as during the scandalous strife between the synods of Basle and Florence; and for some time a formal schism appeared imminent. The so-called Council of Pisa consisted of the four rebellious cardinals, twenty Gallican prelates, several abbots and other dignitaries, the envoys of the King of France, deputies from some of the French Universities, and a considerable number of Doctors of the Faculty of Paris. This assembly justified its position on the ground that there are extraordinary cases in which a Council may be called

* Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiii. p. 1481; Raynald, ad ann. 1510; *Continuat. de Fleury*, Lib. 121, § 117; Longueval, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. xxi. p. 359.

without the intervention of the Pope; and that, since the present Pontiff had neglected to obey the decree of the Council of Constance which enjoined a similar celebration at the interval of every ten years, the cardinals were bound to take the initiative in the matter, according to a solemn engagement which they had made in the conclave when Julius was elected.* After repeating the stereotyped formula concerning the supreme authority of General Councils, and the imperative necessity of a reformation of the Church in its head and in its members, the fathers addressed themselves professedly to the herculean task thus indicated; but little or nothing was effected of any practical importance.

Political emergencies compelled them ere long to transfer their sessions to Milan;† and here, on the 21st of April, 1512, they had the hardihood to publish a decree suspending Pope Julius from all Pontifical functions, as “a notorious disturber of the Council, the author of schism, contumacious, incorrigible, and hardened.”

Louis XII. accepted this sentence by a special edict, and ordered it to be registered and published by the Parliament of Paris; upon which the Pope replied by excommunicating the king, laying the whole of his dominions under an interdict, and absolving his subjects from their oath of allegiance.‡ Louis protested against this bull, and further expressed his indignation by causing coins to be struck bearing the arms of France encircled by the menacing legend, “Perdam Babylonis nomen.”§

Victory declared eventually for the Pope. He succeeded in organizing a formidable coalition against the French; they

* Raynald, *Annal.*, ad ann. 1511.

† It was here that they received the treatise of Cardinal di Vio, or Cajetan, “De auctoritate Papæ, et Concilii sive Ecclesiæ, comparatâ.” This was one of the earliest expositions of the Ultramontane theory of church government. Cajetan maintains the sovereignty of the Pope over the universal Church, but does not contend that he is personally infallible; on the contrary, he admits that a Pope may fall into heresy, and that in that case a Council may depose him. The fathers at Milan referred the

work to the judgment of the Theological Faculty of Paris, and that body commissioned three doctors to write in refutation of it. It was not officially condemned as a whole, but the Faculty censured the author's attempt to disparage the Councils of Constance and Basle, and reaffirmed the Gallican view of their authority.

‡ *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. cxxii. §§ 115, 116, 117.

§ De Thou, *Hist. Univ.*, Liv. i. De Thou adds that these coins were frequently met with in his time.

were expelled ignominiously from the Milanese ; the terrified members of the pseudo-council crossed the Alps in precipitate haste, and took refuge at Lyons, where their situation and pretensions were little short of ridiculous.

In the mean time the fifth Council of Lateran, styled by the Roman Church œcumenical, though its right to that title was scarcely better than that of the assembly at Pisa, commenced its sittings on the 10th of May, 1512.* The Pope presided in person, at the head of fifteen cardinals, and upwards of a hundred prelates, almost all Italian. Here the acts of the schismatical assemblies at Pisa, Milan, and Lyons were solemnly condemned and annulled, and the censures pronounced on the King of France were confirmed. In the fourth session (December 10, 1512) a vigorous attack was made on the Pragmatic Sanction. The letters-patent of Louis XI. were read, by which it had been suppressed at the instance of Pius II. ; after which a monition was published summoning all supporters of that act, of whatsoever rank or dignity, to appear at Rome within sixty days, and show cause why it should not be finally revoked and abolished. The fifth session was not held till the 16th of February, 1513 ; and a few days afterwards the turbulent reign of Julius II. was brought to a close by death. The views and policy of his successor, Leo X., were of a totally opposite character. He made it his first object to restore peace to Christendom ; and circumstances soon enabled him to arrive at a definitive adjustment of the perplexing questions which had been so long pending with the Government of France. Unfortunately, that adjustment amounted to a deliberate betrayal of the first principles of the constitution of the Church ; principles which the Apostolic See ought to have defended and enforced at all hazards.

Louis XII., who was greatly disheartened by his late reverses, lost no time in signifying his desire to effect a reconciliation with the new Pope. This was granted him on easy terms. The French ambassadors attended the eighth session of the Lateran Council, and renounced in their master's name the pretended Councils of Pisa, Milan, and Lyons, accepting that of the Lateran as the sole legitimate and indubitable Council, and engaging

* Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 4.

that the assembly still in session at Lyons should separate within one month. It was also promised that a deputation of the French clergy should repair to Rome to solicit absolution. The fulfilment of this latter article was delayed upon various pretexts, and the Pope, as an act of indulgence, postponed it to the eleventh session of the Council, which was not held till the 19th of December, 1516. Meanwhile the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, an object which the Court of Rome pursued with extraordinary energy, remained in suspense. But an event occurred ere long which wonderfully facilitated the desired arrangement. Louis XII. expired in January, 1515, and was succeeded by Francis I.

It was after the splendid triumph of the French arms at Marignano that Leo judged it advisable to negotiate a final treaty of reconciliation with the Gallican Church. The young monarch, flushed with victory, was at that moment in a position to demand advantageous terms; and it was plain that any agreement must be of the nature of a compromise. Antoine Duprat, Chancellor of France, to whom Francis entrusted the management of this delicate business, was a diplomatist well capable of pressing the terms of a bargain in a sense corresponding with his master's interests; and, knowing that the paramount point with Rome was the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction, he exacted, as the price of it, a boon which legalized and perpetuated the predominance of the Crown in directing the administration of the Church.

The celebrated Concordat of Bologna bears date the 18th of August, 1516.* Many of its provisions were identical with those of the Pragmatic Sanction, for which it was substituted; but there were some conspicuous exceptions. The most important article is that relating to the right of nomination to bishoprics and other "benefices consistoriaux;" this was transferred in express terms from the capitular bodies to the Crown. The king was to present, within six months after the vacancy, a doctor or licentiate in divinity to the Pope, who was thereupon to confirm the appointment and confer canonical institution;—a veto being thus secured to the Holy See upon any choice which did not

* Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 358; Thomassin, II. Lib. i. cap. 4; Isambert, *Anciennes Lois Françaises*, tom. xii. p. 75.

satisfy the requirements of the canons.* The Pope was still to nominate to benefices "in curiâ vacantiâ;" and it was further agreed that every private patron having from ten to fifty benefices in his gift should place one presentation at the disposal of the Pope for the time being, or two, if the number exceeded fifty.† Papal "reservations" and "expective graces" were abolished. The right of University graduates to preferment was recognized, and their privileges considerably extended.‡ Ecclesiastical causes were to be decided within the realm by the ordinary tribunals, or by commissioners named by the Pope in the case of "causæ majores" statutably reserved to his cognizance.§

But the *omissions* from the Concordat were of crucial significance. Entire silence was observed with respect to the memorable decrees of Constance, Basle, and Bourges, which had established the superiority of Councils over the Pope. No mention was made of the annates, which the Pragmatic Sanction had suppressed; || and in consequence of the tacit understanding between the contracting parties on this head, the claim to that impost was immediately revived by the Pope, who regarded it as a right inherently annexed to his See. "Thus," as Mezerai remarks, "the Pope surrendered to the king a purely spiritual privilege, and obtained in return a purely secular advantage."¶

This arbitrary measure excited an outcry of indignation throughout France, and the mandate for its registration was

* In case of a refusal to grant the bulls of institution, the Pope engaged to specify his reasons. This power was not unfrequently exercised, and became a source of serious difficulty.

† Titulus vi., "De Mandatis Apostolicis."

‡ They were to be entitled to the third part of all ecclesiastical benefices.—Titulus v., § 2, "De Graduatis."

§ "Exceptis majoribus in jure expressè denominatis."—Titulus x., "De Causis."

|| It was provided, however (Tit. v., § 9) that a return should be made of the true annual value of all benefices in France for which confirmation was sought at Rome,—a stipulation which implied that the annates were about to

be claimed afresh, and that they would be assessed to their full amount.

¶ Mezerai, *Abregé Chronol.*, tom. ii. p. 904. "Les mieux sensez s'étonnèrent grandement que ces deux Potentats eussent fait ce troc si peu séant à l'un et à l'autre; que le Pape se fust dépouillé du spirituel pour le conférer au Roy, et que sa Majesté, abandonnant le temporel de son état, permist que les plus clairs deniers de son royaume se transportassent à Rome. Par ce mesme moyen le Roy consentit l'abolition de la Pragmatique; mais les bons François s'y opposèrent puissamment, comme à la manifeste ruine de l'Eglise Gallicane, et à la pepinière des simonies et des confidences."

most stubbornly resisted by the Parliament of Paris. After ten days of discussion, the magistrates came to a resolution that it would be contrary to their duty to accept the new ordinance; they appealed against it to "the Pope better informed," and to the next General Council lawfully assembled.* Meanwhile they declared that the Pragmatic Sanction ought to be observed more strictly than ever. If the king was absolutely determined to enforce the reception of the Concordat, they begged that he would cause it to be promulgated in the same way as in the case of the Pragmatic Sanction, namely, by a lawfully convened Council of the Gallican Church. The new decree was combated in like manner by the University of Paris. That body posted notices throughout the city forbidding all booksellers and printers to print and publish it. They drew up an elaborate memorial, setting forth the manifold evils which had arisen from the disuse of free election; tracing to that source the ignorance, incompetence, and depraved morals, which disgraced the higher clergy, as well as the spoliation of the National Church by the inordinate exactions of Rome. In conclusion, the University appealed to the Pope "better informed," and to a future legitimate Council freely assembled. The act of appeal stated that, "although the Pope holds his authority immediately from God, he is not on that account incapable of error; that if he should command anything contrary to the precepts of Divine law, the faithful are not bound to obey him; and that if he shall persist in attempting to enforce submission, the only remedy is to appeal from him to the decision of the Church Universal—a right which none can gainsay, since it is founded on the law of God and that of nature."† Francis, much irritated, issued an edict annulling these proceedings as seditious, and insisting on the immediate acceptance of the obnoxious ordinance. At first the command was disregarded; but the despotic power to which the monarchy had been steadily advancing ever since the time of Philip the Fair prevailed in the end.

In the eleventh session of the Lateran Council (December 19, 1516), Leo X. promulgated the bull "Pastor æternus,"‡ by which the Pragmatic Sanction was finally abrogated and an-

* July 24, 1517. Pinsson, *Hist. Prag. et Concord.*, p. 732.

† DuPlessis d'Argentré, *Collect. Judic.*

de novis Erroribus, tom. i. p. 357. Pinsson, *Hist. Pragmat. et Concordat.*, p. 934.

‡ Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 309.

nulled. It begins with a pompous eulogy of the Christian virtue of obedience; after which it recites that the late Pope Julius, finding that the Pragmatic Sanction ("which might well be called the depravation of the kingdom of France") was still in force, to the peril of souls and the detriment of the Holy See, had caused it to be examined by a Commission of Cardinals, and had cited the French bishops, chapters, and Parliaments, to appear as parties to the cause at Rome. The Pope goes on to state that, after the death of his predecessor, he had judged it right to pursue the same course, and had summoned the parties interested by repeated monitions; in spite of which no one had yet appeared to allege reasons in defence of the measure in question. Under these circumstances he had determined to abolish it altogether, after the example of Leo the Great, who, at the Council of Chalcedon, revoked what had been rashly ordained by the second Council of Ephesus in opposition to the Catholic faith. The fact that the Pragmatic Sanction had been authorized by the councils of Bourges and Basle was no obstacle to its revocation; for it had not been accepted until after the translation of the latter Council by Eugenius IV., which destroyed its validity; since the sovereign Pontiff has plenary power over Councils, to convoke, translate, and dissolve them.* In fine, he declares that the Pragmatic Sanction has no authority whatever; he cancels all the decrees, statutes, and regulations, contained in it; he condemns and annuls all that was done with respect to it in the assembly of Bourges. And forasmuch as it is necessary to salvation that all Christians should be subject to the Roman Pontiff, according to Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and the constitution of Boniface VIII., "Unam sanctam," he therefore renews that constitution, without prejudice to that of Clement V., beginning "Meruit,"† and forbids the faithful,

* These statements are painfully disingenuous. It is true that the Pragmatic Sanction was not enacted till after the translation of the Council of Basle; but the decrees of that Council, upon which the Pragmatic Sanction was framed, were passed, with two exceptions, *before* the translation; and since Pope Eugenius distinctly approved and ratified all the acts of the Council *up to the date*, it follows that all the articles of the Pragmatic Sanction,

except two, were confirmed by the Apostolic See, and possess the authority of an unquestioned General Council of the West. As to the power of the Pope over Councils, which this bull affirms to rest upon canonical legislation, and the confession of Councils themselves, the claim is manifestly untenable, inasmuch as it is based mainly on the False Decretals.

† *Extravag. Commun.*, Lib. v. Tit. vii. cap. 2, "Rex Franciæ et regnicolæ,

clergy and laity, regular and secular, of whatever order, rank, or condition, to make use of the Pragmatic Sanction for the future, or to decide any cause in conformity with its provisions. The penalty denounced was the greater excommunication and deprivation for ecclesiastics, and the forfeiture of fiefs and all dignities in the case of civilians. Another bull, substituting the Concordat for the Pragmatic Sanction, was read in the same session.

The Parliament of Paris persisted in its opposition until it was on the brink of an open rupture with the sovereign. A royal message, on the 12th of March, 1517,* warned the magistrates that, if the new edict was not registered and published without further discussion and delay, his Majesty would be compelled to resort to extremities which would give them cause for regret.† It was now felt that it would be dangerous further to resist the king's pleasure; the Parliament, therefore, yielded in form; but this was done in the most reserved and qualified terms possible, under protest that it was purely an act of submission to the crown,‡ and that the Parliament by no means designed thereby to authorize or approve of the Concordat. The magistrates also declared that they would continue to adjudicate appeals in ecclesiastical matters in accordance with the Pragmatic Sanction as heretofore.§

Nor did this forced surrender terminate the struggle. The execution of the Concordat was vigorously contested for years afterwards. Cathedral and monastic chapters proceeded to elect bishops and abbots under the provisions of the Pragmatic Sanction; and every such case became a fresh source of exasperation between the contending powers. The disputed elections were referred for arbitration, according to the views and feelings of the parties interested, sometimes to the Council of State, some-

per Extravagantem Unam Sanctam non amplius subjiciuntur Ecclesiæ Romanæ, quàm prius erant."

* *I. e.* 1518, according to the present mode of reckoning. The legal year began at that time at Easter.

† Pinsson, *Hist. Pragmat. et Concordat.*, p. 929.

‡ The edict, when registered, was endorsed as follows: "Lecta, publicata, et registrata, ex ordinatione et præ-

cepto Domini nostri Regis, reiteratis vicibus facto, in præsentia Domini de Tremoilliâ, primi Cambellani dicti Dom. nostri Regis, ad hoc per eum specialiter missi. Parisiis in Parlamento, 22^o die Martii ann. Dom. 1517."

§ Pinsson, *Hist. Pragmat. et Concord.*, p. 734; Crevier, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris*, tom. v. p. 111; Longueval, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.*, tom. xxii. p. 71.

times to the Parliament of Paris. Conflicting judgments were pronounced; the Royal Council decided for the royal nominee; the Parliament ruled that the individual on whom the choice of the chapter had fallen was duly elected. But the Parliament, though clamouring loudly for the "Gallican liberties," and making a gallant stand for national independence as against the usurpations of Rome, was unable to maintain its ground against the overpowering despotism of the Crown. The monarchical authority ultimately achieved a complete triumph. In 1527 a peremptory royal ordinance prohibited the courts of Parliament from taking further cognisance of causes affecting elections to consistorial benefices and conventual priories; and all such matters were transferred to the sole jurisdiction of the Council of State.* After this the agitation against the Concordat gradually subsided.

But although, in virtue of its compulsory registration by the Parliament, the Concordat became part of the law of the land, it is certain that the Gallican Church never accepted this flagrant invasion of its liberties. On the contrary, the clergy lost no opportunity of protesting against it, and petitioned the crown unceasingly for the restoration of freedom of election. In their assembly at Melun in 1579 they adopted a "remonstrance" to Henry III., demanding this privilege as belonging to the Church by Divine right. "It would have been for the interest of the Pope and of the kings of France," they argued, "if the Concordat had never come to pass. Since that time the Church of France has declined; heresy made its appearance at the same moment, and has gained ground to the extent which we now witness. The condition of the Church while the elections were in force, as compared with that which has resulted from the royal nominations, shows that it was vitally important to maintain the primitive rule; and the foresight of our Parliament has thus been fully vindicated, in its refusal to approve the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction; which law it justly regarded as the main safeguard against the abuses which have since been prevalent."† Similar representations were made to the throne by the synod of 1588, when the Bishop of S. Brieux

* Pinsson, *Hist. Pragmat. et Concord.*, p. 751.

† *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. xiii. p. 40.

reminded his Majesty that his grandfather, Francis I., when lying on his death-bed, had acknowledged to his son, Henry II., that "there was nothing which weighed so heavily upon his conscience as the measure by which he had suppressed the free elections, and assumed the nomination to cathedrals and monasteries."*

The practical working of the Concordat seems to have been, in some respects, preferable to that of the system of capitular election, which had engendered scandalous abuses. But it was attended with one signal disadvantage. Under the new order of things both those who attained and those who aspired to the high places of the Church became, almost inevitably, courtiers; their spiritual character was in perpetual danger of being merged in that of temporal grandees and political functionaries. The bishops were unquestionably more *national* in their views and tendencies under the modern arrangement—more vigilant in resisting the aggressions and encroachments of the Papacy; but, in the same proportion, they were less capable of opposing any effectual barrier to the strides by which the monarchy was marching towards absolute dominion. They dared not assume the attitude of fearless champions of the constitutional rights of their order, and of the Divine economy of the Church; they contracted a tone of servile dependence, unqualified admiration, and fulsome flattery, in their communications with the sovereign. In addition to this, the "haute noblesse" were enabled, by means of the new system, to establish almost a monopoly of the richer Church preferments. Bishoprics and abbacies became practically hereditary in certain great families, and were regarded as the ordinary provision for younger sons. This grave abuse was palpably fostered by the article of the Concordat which declared princes of the blood royal and persons of noble birth eligible for preferment without being graduates of the Universities.† A race of dignitaries was thus created who rarely owed their promotion to any claims on the score of theological attainment or pastoral efficiency.

Although it would be difficult to imagine anything more diametrically opposed than the Concordat to the primitive insti-

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. xiii. p. 134.

† *Textus Concordatorum*, Titulus iii.,

"De regiâ ad Prælaturas nominatione faciendâ." Cf. Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Discip.*, II. Lib. ii. c. 40.

tutions of the Church, the circumstances under which it was obtained were such that it might be colourably described as a national protest against certain usurpations and exactions hitherto practised by the court of Rome. This operated, in great measure, as a veil to its true character. So keen was the satisfaction caused by the removal of some of the heaviest burdens under which the Church had groaned for centuries through spiritual misgovernment, that the immense increase of power which was thrown at the same time into the hands of the civil ruler was comparatively overlooked. Thus the Concordat was complacently quoted by its admirers as establishing the "Gallican liberties;" whereas it was, in fact, the most formidable blow that had yet been dealt towards their extinction.* The interests which it really served were those of modern pseudo-Gallicanism;—a system of which it is no exaggeration to say that it proved ruinous to the National Church of France.†

* "Quo tempore juris communis et libertatis ecclesiasticæ regulæ funditus abrogatæ sunt, Pragmaticæ Sanctionis et sacrarum electionum antiquatione."
—Edm. Richer, *Defens. Lib. de Eccles.*

et Polit. Potest., Lib. v. cap. iv.

† The Concordat of Francis I. is ably analysed in the work of the Abbé de Pradt, *Les Quatre Concordats*, tom. i. chap. xv., Paris, 1818.

THE GALLICAN CHURCH

FROM THE CONCORDAT OF BOLOGNA TO THE REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE Concordat of Bologna was substantially a triumph of the absolutist principle, as represented by the King and the Pope, over the constitutional, as embodied in the liberties of the Gallican Church. The Pope arbitrarily conferred upon the Crown a prerogative which was not his to bestow, obtaining in exchange the formal repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and, by consequence, a tacit repudiation of the odious Councils of Constance and Basle. For the Crown the bargain was a cheap one; since the concession thus purchased not only invested it with the vast patronage of an enormously wealthy establishment, but supplied, withal, a convenient instrument for controlling the spirit of ecclesiastical independence.

Yet it was a dangerous experiment on both sides. For days of trial were at hand. Storms were gathering on the horizon, which threatened the stability of all principles and all institutions belonging to the mediæval structure of society; and, among the rest, the fidelity of the Church of France to her natural protectors, who had so ungenerously leagued together to betray her liberties, was about to be rudely tested. The Concordat synchronized with the commencement of the (so-called) Reformation.

I do not purpose to enter upon a regularly detailed narrative of the transactions of this tempestuous period—a period which exhibited in France scenes of internecine strife, fanatical extravagance, and remorseless cruelty, unparalleled elsewhere in Europe. These are amply described in the contemporary chronicles, and also by the various modern writers who have treated of the rise and progress of French Protestantism. I shall content myself with tracing the general line of action pursued by the National Church during these perplexing times,

including some account of the proceedings of its representatives at the eventful deliberations of the Council of Trent.

The outcry for ecclesiastical reform, which led eventually to the terrible conflicts and convulsions of the sixteenth century, was twofold;—arising partly from inveterate abuses in the practical administration of the Church, and partly from the alleged corruption of primitive doctrine. With regard to the former class of grievances, it was denied by none that the condition of the Church afforded just ground for reproach: this was a patent fact, frankly acknowledged by all right-minded Catholics. All the world was well aware that the higher Church appointments were made from motives of political ambition, Court favouritism, family interest, or sordid avarice, rather than from considerations of real merit and the public advantage. The superior clergy were notoriously pluralists—bishoprics and abbeys being granted *in commendam* to such an extent that residence, or any approach to efficient pastoral supervision, was simply impossible. Simony was systematically practised: even the Court, the Ministers of State, the proudest nobles, were no strangers to this shameful traffic. Rich preferments were lavished upon persons manifestly incapable of holding them—upon laymen, married men, military officers, young children, even upon females. These anomalous incumbents enjoyed the revenues, while the duties were abandoned to miserably-paid substitutes, styled “confidentiaires” or “custodinos.” An annalist of the time assures us that towards the middle of the century the greater part of the benefices in France were in the hands of persons disqualified according to the Canons.*

It was maintained, however, by the clergy, that the true remedy for these monstrous evils was perfectly clear, and that it lay with the State to apply that remedy. Let the Crown consent to relinquish the privilege it had acquired by the Concordat, and restore the primitive usage of free election. In that case, they were convinced that most of the prevalent disorders would be effectually checked, and would ere long disappear. The Episcopate, if the elective franchise were once more entrusted to the clergy, would consist of men distinguished by all the qualifications for their exalted office. They would reside among their flocks; they would enforce the wholesome discipline en-

* Pierre de l'Estoile, *Registre-Journal de Henri III.*

joined by the Councils; they would diligently instruct the young and ignorant; they would carefully expound the meaning of the Church's venerable ceremonial; they would vindicate the authority of that pure Catholic tradition which had come down from inspired Apostles. This was the only sure way to stem the rising tide of irreverent innovation, to extirpate heresy, and to restore the unity of Christendom.

The clergy pressed these views on the attention of the Government with unwearied earnestness.* And, although they were perhaps over-sanguine in imagining that the re-establishment of free election would act as a panacea for all the spiritual distempers of the age, it must be acknowledged that their demand was just, and their reasoning weighty.

The Crown, however, turned a deaf ear to their representations, and obstinately declined to surrender its prerogative of patronage. From the secular point of view, there was no ground for making any alteration in the existing relations between Church and State.

But there was a second branch of the reforming movement, namely, that which tended towards doctrinal changes, under the plea that the Church had departed widely, in many essential particulars, from the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the earliest ages. This the Gallican clergy steadily discountenanced; upholding, with unshaken consistency, the system of belief which had prevailed for centuries throughout the Latin obedience. It is true that there were some members of the Episcopate who sympathized with the Lutheran opinions to a certain extent. Such were, during the earlier stage of the agitation, Guillaume Briçonnet Bishop of Meaux, Jacques Spifame Bishop of Nevers, Pelissier Bishop of Maguelonne, Etienne Poncher Bishop of Paris, afterwards Archbishop of Sens; and, at a later period, Cardinal de Chatillon Bishop of Beauvais, St. Romain Archbishop of Aix, Montluc Bishop of Valence, Guillard of Chartres, and Barbançon of Pamiers. But little impression was made upon the minds of the great body of the clergy. In proportion as it became clear that the Protestant leaders aimed at nothing short of religious revolution—that they were prepared to incur all the risks of permanent divorce from

* See the *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. ii. p. 241 *et seqq.*

the visible centre of Catholic unity—the French Church rallied round the throne of St. Peter with intense and indomitable zeal. The venerable Sorbonne—that “perpetual Gallican Council,” as it has been styled*—displayed a vigilance which nothing could elude, and uttered, with no uncertain sound, its judgments on the various phases of heterodox speculation as they appeared. Luther, in the course of his conferences with Cardinal Cajetan, had spoken with great respect of the Theological Faculty of Paris, and professed himself willing to submit his doctrine to its verdict. The divines accordingly examined his various published works, and in a session on the 13th of April, 1521, condemned a series of more than one hundred propositions extracted from them, as “heretical, schismatical, impious, and blasphemous.”†

They pointed out, in the preface to this sentence, that Lutheranism, in many of its characteristic features, was but a specious reproduction of errors long since proscribed and exploded. Like the Montanists, Luther rejected the authority of the Church; like the Manicheans, he denied the freedom of the will; he coincided with the Hussites in disparaging the Sacrament of Penance—with the Wickliffites in repudiating Confession—with the Catharini, the Waldenses, the Bohemians, in attacking the privileges of the clergy, railing against the ecclesiastical Courts, and cavilling at counsels of evangelical perfection. He had the audacity to prefer his own judgment to that of the most profoundly learned doctors of antiquity, and even to the decrees of Œcumenical Councils;—as if the Almighty had revealed the way of salvation exclusively to Martin Luther, and had left His Church for fifteen centuries in ignorance of essential truth. Proceeding to enumerate the tenets to which the censure applied, the Sorbonne placed in the front rank that favourite sophism of the Wittenburg professor, that inasmuch as all Christians are (in one sense) priests, the power of the Keys belongs to all in common, and that they all possess the same authority with regard to preaching God’s Word and administering the Sacraments. Among other sentiments reprehended are the following:—That the faith of the recipient constitutes the efficacy of sacraments. That absolution is effectual, not by

* “Le concile perpetuel des Gaules, l’Aréopage de l’Eglise, et le flambeau de la foi.”—Mezerai, *Abregé Chronolog.*

† Duplessis d’Argentré, *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, tom. i. p. 365.

virtue of what is done by the priest, but by virtue of the penitent's *believing* that he is pardoned. That moral virtues and speculative sciences are not truly virtues and sciences, but rather sins and errors. That the just man sins even in his good works, the best possible action being nevertheless a venial sin. That it is mistaken to say that we know not whether we are in a state of grace; the believer ought never to be in doubt whether his works are acceptable to God; for whosoever thus doubts commits sin, and all his efforts are vain and worthless. That it is wrong to say that God has laid upon us no commands which are impossible, since no man, however holy, has ever kept the last two commandments of the Decalogue; notwithstanding which we are guilty of sin in not fulfilling them. That the Church has suffered infinite damage for hundreds of years past through the corruption of Holy Scripture by its doctors. That the introduction of Scholastic theology has led to the abandonment of the religion of the cross. That many opinions condemned by Councils, for instance, many of those held by John Huss and the Bohemians, are orthodox, and cannot be lawfully censured. That neither Pope nor Bishop, nor any human authority, can enact the smallest ordinance as binding upon the faithful unless they consent to it; and that whatever has been otherwise ordained is simply tyrannical.

Not content with this vigorous demonstration against Luther, the Parisian doctors, a few years later, passed a severe censure on the 'Colloquies' of the great Erasmus;—a work in which the author, without advancing statements which could be taxed with formal heresy, had criticised, in a style of trenchant satire, some of the most venerated institutions of the Church. Erasmus was denounced by the Syndic of the Faculty, Noël Bêda, a man of fervent and apparently intemperate zeal. A sharp controversy ensued, in which Erasmus defended himself with remarkable ingenuity, and, while avowing himself an advocate of reformation, at the same time vindicated his character as an attached and dutiful son of the Church. He concluded by appealing for protection to Francis I. That monarch, whose generous patronage of men of letters was one of his most estimable qualities, interposed at once, in the arbitrary fashion of the time, and ordered the Parliament to suppress the writings of Bêda. But the Sorbonne, undeterred by this exhibition of royal partisanship,

pursued their investigation of the case, and in due course pronounced sentence upon thirty-two extracts of a heterodox tendency from different works of Erasmus.* These related chiefly to matters connected with the disciplinary system of the Church;—to oaths, vows, celibacy, divorce, fasting, the observance of festivals, and other ceremonial usages. Francis testified his displeasure with the Faculty for their boldness on this occasion by giving orders that a new edition of 24,000 copies of the ‘Colloquies’ should immediately be printed at Paris.

Nor did the Gallican Church fail to declare itself against the Lutheran innovations by the more authoritative method of synodical decision. Six Provincial Councils were held for this purpose in one year, 1527-8, at Lyons, Paris, Bourges, Reims, Tours, and Rouen. Of these the most celebrated is the Council of the province of Sens, which met at Paris on the 3rd of February, 1527, and sat till the following October, 1528. The Metropolitan, Cardinal Du Prat, Archbishop of Sens and Chancellor of France, presided, and was attended by six of his suffragans, the Bishops of Paris, Chartres, Meaux, Auxerre, Troyes, and Nevers, with the vicar-general of the Bishop of Orleans, and a numerous assemblage of the clergy of the province.†

Sixteen decrees or canons (*decreta fidei*) were promulgated by this Synod, enunciating the Catholic faith with reference to the principal points controverted by the Protestants. These affirm, in very precise and stringent terms, the unity and the infallibility of the Church; that there is no covenanted salvation beyond its pale; that it is a visible body,—the Lutheran notion of an invisible Church being “not only heretical, but the very well-spring of all heresies;” that it is represented by General Councils, which have the power of deciding all questions affecting the purity of the faith, the extirpation of heresy, the reformation of the Church, and the correction of manners; and that those who obstinately resist them must be accounted enemies to the faith. The synod next asserts the authority of the Church in fixing the canon and determining the true sense of Holy Scripture; and declares that those who despise the guidance of the orthodox Fathers to follow that of their own private understand-

* Du Boulai, *Hist. de l'Univ. de Paris*, tom. vi. D'Argentré, *Collect. Judiciorum*.

† Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 444 et seqq.

ing are to be classed with schismatics and heretics. Further, it establishes the necessity and validity of Catholic tradition, and condemns those who reject a doctrine or observance under the pretext that it is not explicitly laid down in Holy Writ. The Canon on the Sacraments (Decret. 10) defines their number, seven, and explains in what manner each of them is a true instrument or vehicle of Divine grace. A separate article teaches that, in the Mass, the Body and Blood of Christ are truly offered by the priest as the proper and peculiar sacrifice of the new law. The 15th decree maintains the real freedom of man's will, yet without excluding thereby the action of Divine grace. The human will, being assisted by the secret inspiration of prevenient grace,* draws nigh to God, and prepares itself for that sanctifying grace by which it is at length accepted unto life eternal. It is true that God draws us towards Himself, but not by constraint; it is true that He predestines, elects, and calls us, but He glorifies those only who, being rooted in faith and charity, have "made their calling and election sure" by good works. The 16th and last dogmatic decree affirms that faith is then only effectual to salvation when it "worketh by love;" since the righteous will be accepted at the last day, not because they have believed, but because they have abounded in good works. "It is not, therefore, faith alone that justifies, but rather charity; and good works not only are not sins, but in adults are necessary to salvation, and may in that respect be considered meritorious."†

The decrees are followed by a catalogue of the various errors ventilated by the heretics of the day, in opposition to the foregoing doctrines of the Church. The acts of the Council conclude with an earnest exhortation to the princes of Christendom to labour for the extermination of heretics. "If they would consult their own safety—if they desired to maintain intact the rights of their own sovereignty—if they would preserve the nations subject to them in peace and tranquillity—let them protect the Catholic faith with a strong arm, and manfully subdue (*debellare*) its enemies."

Thus distinctly and decisively did the Gallican Church

* "*Misericordiæ prævenientis auxilio suffulta, et interiori quodam et occulto secretioris inspirationis afflatu contacta.*"

† "*Eatenus adultis ad salutem necessaria, ut meriti quoque rationem non respuant.*"

express her mind on the eve of the great battle between the prescriptive authority of the Past and the new-fledged independence of thought engendered by the Reformation. The reader will not fail to observe that, in the proceedings of this important Synod, while language of the most unqualified kind is employed to set forth the supreme jurisdiction of the Church Catholic, and of General Councils as its representatives, no mention is to be found of the dogma of the absolute supremacy, much less of the personal infallibility, of the Pope. The Ultramontane theory of Church government—enunciated as it had been with the utmost technical precision by Cardinals Torquemada and Cajetan—was professed at this time, to its full extent, by the Roman Curia and its accredited divines; and it is true, moreover, that since the last Lateran Council a certain reaction had set in against the limitations attempted to be imposed on the Pontifical authority by the Councils of Constance, Basle, and Bourges. Nevertheless, the principles of Gerson and D'Ailly—representing, as they did in the main, those of the primitive undivided Church—were still predominant in France. By opposing to the innovators that authority which, beyond all question, belongs to the collective Episcopate (since that body occupies by succession the place of the Apostles*), the Gallican prelates took their stand on a vantage-ground from which nothing could dislodge them. Those who found it necessary to defy the consentient tradition of the whole Catholic world confessed thereby the untenableness of their own position; and it is not to be wondered at that, ere long, they pursued such perverse reasonings to their logical conclusion, and openly seceded from the visible communion of the Church.

The project of a General Council of the West, for the settlement of the momentous questions at issue between the Church and the Protestants, was agitated for many years, as is well known, before it was found possible to carry it into execution. The idea was originally propounded by the Lutherans of Germany. It was formally sanctioned by the Diet of Spire in 1529, and it was the theme of lengthened consultations between Charles V. and Pope Clement VII. when they met at Bologna

* "Apud nos Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent." S. Jerome, *Epist.* xxvii. ad Marcellam. Opp. tom. iv. Pt. II. p. 65.

in the following year. Personally, Clement was opposed to the holding of a Council, for reasons which he fully explained in a letter to the Emperor, preserved by Martin Du Bellay.* He was not in a position, however, to resist the repeated and urgent demands of Charles; and, after much hesitation, he signified a reluctant consent upon certain conditions. These were, that the place of meeting should be on the Italian side of the Alps; that those who attended the Council should engage beforehand to submit to its decrees; and that, in the mean time, no innovation should be allowed in Germany with regard to points of controverted doctrine.† A nuncio was now despatched to bespeak the co-operation of the King of France in the design, which was readily promised; and Francis appealed accordingly to the Landgrave of Hesse, and other Protestant princes with whom he was in alliance, to accept the Council on the proffered terms, as the only chance remaining for the restoration of religious unity. But the Protestants declined these overtures; or rather, they insisted, as an indispensable condition of their adhesion, that the Council should be held in Germany; adding, moreover, other stipulations which the Pope pronounced inadmissible. And, in truth, it must be confessed that matters had by this time reached such a point that the scheme of reconciling the Reformers to the Church by the expedient of a Council was simply chimerical. It is true that Luther and his friends had demanded that mode of arbitration in the early days of the movement; but at that date they had not taken the decisive steps which placed them in open antagonism to the Church. By their subsequent proceedings, in separating from the Apostolically-descended hierarchy, and inventing a novel form of ministry unsanctioned by a valid succession, they rejected the essential principles upon which alone the action of a Council is legitimately based. Lutheran and Calvinist sectaries could not well be admitted to sit and vote in synod on equal terms with Catholic prelates; and even if this difficulty could have been overcome, there was little or no prospect of a satisfactory result, inasmuch as the recusants did not acknowledge the supreme authority of General Councils; whatever

* *Mémoires de M. Du Bellay*, Liv. iv.

† *Fra Paolo, Hist. du C. de Trente*, Liv. i. § 47 (Edit. Courayer). *Ellies-Dupin, Hist. Eccles.* tom. vi. chap. xxiii.

conclusions, therefore, might be arrived at, they might disallow or evade them at pleasure.

Nevertheless, the negotiations were not discontinued. Paul III., who succeeded Clement, seems to have been sincere and earnest in endeavouring to conduct them to a practical effect; but his efforts were long counteracted by one grave obstacle, namely, the bitter personal enmity which reigned between the leading princes of Christendom, the Emperor and the King of France. Both the civil and the ecclesiastical policy of Francis I. were full of inconsistencies; in fact he may be said to have had no real policy except that of blind, passionate hostility to Charles V. This is the master-key to all the anomalies of his reign with regard to the treatment of the Protestant Reformers. If he encouraged them, it was in order to strengthen his own domestic interests and to embarrass and distress his rival; if he persecuted them (and this he did at times with merciless rigour), it was with a view to curry favour with the Pope, whose good graces might otherwise have been monopolised by the Emperor.

For upwards of twenty years, with brief intervals, did Francis, single-handed, struggle for predominance in Europe against the concentrated strength of the Germanic empire; and it was not till the Peace of Crespy, in 1544, that the two monarchs could be brought to agree on any plan of combined action for the suppression of heresy and the pacification of the Church. Paul III. now hastened to convoke at Trent, for the spring of the year following, the General Council which had been so importunately demanded of him and his predecessors.

No sooner, however, had the Synod commenced its sittings, than it appeared that the feud between the two great Catholic potentates, instead of being extinguished, was merely transferred to a new scene. The emperor, as the principal promoter of the Council, naturally desired that his influence should predominate in it; Francis strained every nerve to prevent this, and to establish his own ascendancy. The Pope, meanwhile, maintaining an attitude of vigilant neutrality between the competitors, laboured so to shape and control the proceedings of the assembly as to subserve above all things the interests of the Holy See.

Feelings of jealousy sprang up ere long between the Pope and Charles, in consequence of the advantages gained by the

latter over the revolted Protestants in the brief campaign of 1547. Paul had supported him in this movement; but he now began to view the success of his arms with apprehension, lest it should tend to reduce the Council at Trent altogether into subjection to the Imperial will. At the risk, therefore, of giving mortal offence to Charles, he availed himself of the first plausible pretext for removing the Synod from Trent to Bologna, a city within his own dominions. The emperor protested vehemently, and most of the German bishops refused, by his orders, to quit Trent. Francis, for the sole reason that the emperor's influence was less likely to prevail at Bologna, seconded the Papal policy; and the result of these intrigues was that the deliberations were suspended for the space of nearly four years.

The action of the Gallican Church was much embarrassed by these political complications. During the earlier sessions at Trent it was represented by only four prelates—the Archbishop of Aix, the Bishops of Clermont, Agde, and Rennes; and in the memorable decrees concerning original sin and justification it cannot be said to have taken any effective part. Francis, however, sent three ambassadors, one of whom, Pierre Danès, a man of superior talent and learning, made an energetic speech on taking his seat. He descanted on the eminent services which the kings of France had rendered to the Church in all ages, eulogised the religious zeal of the reigning monarch, and pleaded powerfully for the preservation of the well-known rights and privileges enjoyed, by immemorial tradition, both by Church and State in France.*

The Cardinal-Legate Del Monte, in reply, thanked the ambassador for the sentiments he had expressed in the name of his sovereign; assured him that the Concordat granted by Leo X., as well as all other privileges, should be preserved to his Most Christian Majesty, “so far as equity and the present position of affairs would admit;” and pledged himself that the proceedings of the Council should be such as to give the king no reason to repent of the affection and sympathy which he had testified towards the Church.

Henry II. trod in the footsteps of his father; and during his reign the tide of animosity between France, the Empire,

* Fra Paolo, Liv. ii. § 71.

and the Papacy, ran higher than ever. Hostilities broke out upon the subject of the duchy of Parma; the King of France pertinaciously supporting the cause of Ottavio Farnese, whom the Pope (Julius III.) had denounced as a rebellious vassal of the Holy See. The emperor—more for the sake of opposing France than for any other reason—sided with Julius, and declared war against Parma in May, 1551. At this juncture the Pope, in compliance with the wishes of Charles, determined to reassemble the Council of Trent, and took measures for that purpose, contrary to all precedent, without previous consultation with the King of France, “the eldest son of the Church.”* In the “bull of resumption” the only prince mentioned by name was “our beloved son in Christ, Charles Emperor of the Romans.” Henry, indignant at this treatment, not only refused to permit the prelates of his realm to obey the summons to Trent, but ordered them to repair to their dioceses and prepare for the celebration of a National Council, which he purposed to convoke without delay.† As a further mark of resentment, he prohibited, by letters-patent, the transmission of money in any shape from France to Rome. Upon this the Pope despatched an envoy to explain and adjust matters; but Henry was not to be pacified; he persisted in standing aloof from the Council, and pointed out (what was, indeed, true) that, in the absence of the Gallican episcopate, and deprived of the co-operation of the “eldest son of the Church,” that assembly could not be regarded as œcumenical.

At the same time he assured his Holiness, through his ambassadors at Rome, that he was by no means averse to a General Council, provided it were such as it ought to be, for the advantage, repose, and reunion of the Universal Church—for the increase and preservation of true religion, and the ex

* Henry, however, had declared strongly in opposition to the Council. See his letter to De Termes, his ambassador at Rome, in Ribier, *Lettres et Mémoires d'Etat*, tom. ii. “Je n’ai que faire de demander le Concile, pour ce que mon royaume n’en a point de besoin, étant tous mes sujets bons Catholiques et très obéissants à l’Eglise; et s’il y en a aucuns desvoyants, ils sont si bien chastiés que les autres y doivent prendre exemple. Mais c’est à

faire à la Germanie et aux autres royaumes qui en ont besoin à le requérir. Et quant à la manière de vivre des ministres de l’Eglise qui sont en mon royaume, si reformation y estait requise, il y a en iceluy un assez grand nombre de prelates, gens de sainte vie et religion, pour y pourvoir, sans pour ce se mettre en peine d’assembler un Concile Général.”

† Fra Paolo, Liv. iv. § 3.

tirpation of prevailing errors and abuses;—the assembling of such a Council was an object which he desired above all things.* In short, the real ground of Henry's opposition was precisely that of his predecessor; that in an ecclesiastical assembly sitting at Trent, the views, influence, and authority of the German Emperor would to a certainty predominate.

At the first session of the restored synod (September 1, 1551) Jacques Amyot, Abbot of Belloczane,† made his appearance as special envoy from the King of France, and presented a letter addressed "to the most holy and venerable fathers in Christ of the Tridentine Assembly" (*conventus*). This superscription, being deemed offensive to the dignity of the Council, provoked angry comments, and it was with difficulty that the document was at length received and read.‡ It contained an exposition of the reasons by which Henry felt himself precluded from taking part in the proceedings; reflected somewhat severely on the conduct of the Pope; renewed the protest which had been made previously by the French representatives at Rome; and concluded by stating that his Majesty and the Gallican Church could not recognize the Council as legitimate, and must, therefore, decline to be in any way bound by its decrees.

The fathers of Trent, in reply, expressed their deep regret that opposition should have arisen in a quarter from which the Council might reasonably look for cordial support; observed that the road to Trent was as freely open to the prelates of France as to those of any other nation; and besought them, even at the eleventh hour, to obey the Pope's citation, and join the deliberations of their brethren.

Thus hampered by the secular dissensions of the day, the French Church found itself excluded from all share in the eventful debates which preceded the Tridentine definitions on the Sacrament of the Eucharist and Transubstantiation.§

Indeed the difficulties arising from the religious aspect of affairs at this period involved the Government in a course of

* See the king's letter to Cardinal de Tournon and De Termes, the ambassador, in Ribier, *Lettres et Mémoires d'Etat*, tom. ii. p. 331.

† The learned translator of *Plutarch's Lives*. He was also preceptor to the royal children, afterwards Francis II.,

Charles IX., and Henry III. Charles IX. made him "Grand Aumonier" and Bishop of Auxerre.

‡ De Thou, Liv. viii. Fra Paolo, Liv. iv. § 7.

§ Concil. Trident., Sess. xiii.

conduct which was glaringly—almost ludicrously—self-contradictory. At the very moment when Henry was thus embroiled with the Pope, and exhibiting his independence by forbidding his subjects to send money to Rome, he was cruelly persecuting the Calvinists, who had but gone a few steps farther, and renounced the authority of the Roman Pontiff altogether. Again while proscribing Protestantism, under the severest penalties in his own dominions, he was making common cause with Maurice of Saxony and his confederates, who, as declared champions of Protestantism, had defied the Emperor, and plunged Germany into civil war. Nor was he at all more logical in vaunting his privileges as the “eldest son of the Church,” while in the same breath he forbade the bishops of France to repair to a regularly-constituted Council, and even threatened to convene a local assembly in direct opposition to it. Such were some of the singular incongruities which marked the earlier stages of the Reformation. So true is it, that in estimating most of the great public acts which helped to mould the destinies of Europe at that perplexing crisis, we must refer them to political, rather than to purely religious, considerations. Even princes who were thoroughly Catholic at heart were often driven to belie their convictions, and act injuriously to the real interests of the Church, by motives which on examination prove at best to have been utterly worldly,—suggested by mere self-love and personal pique.

In the sixteenth session, April 28th, 1552, a Papal Bull was read announcing the suspension of the Council for the second time. The reason assigned was the sudden outbreak of hostilities between the Emperor and the Elector of Saxony. The latter prince (who was in alliance, as before mentioned, with the King of France), had routed the Imperialists in several actions, and entered Augsburg in triumph on the 1st of April. These tidings spread consternation at Trent, and numbers of prelates and divines fled from the city in extreme confusion. The Council, though nominally suspended for two years only, now remained in abeyance till the accession of Pope Pius IV whose bull, issued November 29, 1560, directed it to reassemble at Trent at Easter the year ensuing.

CHAPTER II.

DURING this interval, the disciples of Calvin, encouraged by the success of their co-religionists in Germany, and by the vacillating conduct of the authorities at home, propagated their opinions to a prodigious extent in France. It was in the year 1555, as we learn from Theodore Beza,* that the first place of public Protestant worship was opened at Paris. The example was contagious, and conventicles were speedily established at Orleans, Rouen, Blois, Tours, Bourges, Agen, and other towns. Consistories were next organized; synods were held; and ere long the schism from the Church began to assume the appearance of a settled institution. How to deal with a movement whose aggressions became daily more audacious and more formidable was, for Catholics, the all-absorbing problem of the day.

The numerical strength of French Protestantism, in the middle of the sixteenth century, has been variously estimated; some writers carrying it as high as the tenth, or even the eighth, part of the entire population, others depressing it as low as the seventeenth. Taking the mean between these extremes, the sectaries probably mustered about one million and a half.†

From the first their cause had been supported by personages of exalted rank and station; but by degrees it acquired zealous partizans in all grades of society. It was warmly patronized by the *savans*—by those who had borne the most active part in the recent “renaissance” of art, science, and classical learning. It had made many notable converts among the magistracy and “gens de la robe;” and it was encouraged generally by men of education, capacity, and enlarged views, who, without endorsing

* Beza, *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, Liv. iii. p. 211.

† Lettres de Prosper de Saint Croix (*Archives Curieuses de l'Hist. de France*, tom. vi. p. 48). Martin, *Hist. de*

France, tom. ix. p. 201. In 1562 there were about 8000 Huguenots in Paris; which city contained at that time 300,000 inhabitants. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, tom. xviii. p. 256.

all the extravagances of Luther and Calvin, sincerely advocated a practical regeneration of the Church, and desired to see that great work conducted by the Church herself. The most powerful promoters of the Reformation in France—morally and intellectually speaking—were to be found in this latter class; and had their counsels prevailed in the actual direction of the course of affairs, it may be safely affirmed that the history of the second half of the sixteenth century would have worn a very different complexion.

But the predominant influences were, unfortunately, of a more questionable kind. The agitation for reform in the Church was complicated, from its commencement, with political interests, ambitious intrigues, private enmities, and selfish passions. The leaders on both sides professed to be actuated by the highest and most sacred principles; nor need we doubt that religion was honestly felt to be the most important issue at stake. But religious concerns were so speciously mixed up with considerations of a worldly nature, that the lower motive was continually mistaken for the higher; and thus, in the case both of Catholics and Protestants, the cause nominally advocated was in reality endangered and betrayed.

The Huguenots (as the French reformers now began to be called) had up to this time been simply a sect of dissenters from the national Church; but ere long they were driven, by the force of circumstances, into the position of a seditious faction in the State. The heads of the party were two malcontent princes of the blood-royal, burning with indignation against a rival family of scarcely less illustrious lineage, which had adroitly possessed itself of the chief direction of affairs. It was perfectly natural that the King of Navarre and his brother the prince of Condé should aspire to the enjoyment of that political consequence which seemed to befit their near relationship to the throne. It was no less natural that they should endeavour to transfer to themselves that authority which they deemed to have been unfairly usurped by the House of Guise. But to suppose that the governing spring of their conduct was *religion*, would be an egregious misconception of the truth. It cost them nothing, on the score of conscience, to profess the Calvinist creed; while it so happened that that profession opened a most promising prospect for the advancement of their worldly

fortunes ; and it was the pursuit of this *latter* object which at length misled them into armed insurrection and treason.

The Admiral de Coligny and his brother François D'Andelot were, it is true, men of a higher stamp ; Protestants by strong conviction ; conscientiously devoted to the cause of what they considered to be essential truth. But they were also deeply imbued with the spirit of political partisanship ; they thirsted for ascendancy and power ; they were swayed by personal jealousies and deadly animosities. And in consequence, they were not unfrequently blind to the real character of acts and counsels, which, but for the mischievous sophistry of party spirit, they would probably have been the first to condemn.

The conduct of those who held the reins of government betrayed similar weaknesses, and was manifestly prompted by secondary and unworthy motives. Ambition, haughtiness, rapacity, cruelty, were the besetting sins of the House of Lorraine. These princes claimed descent by direct succession from Charlemagne ; and not only esteemed themselves the equals in blood of the reigning family in France, but even maintained pretensions, more or less plausible, to the reversion of their inheritance.*

The two elder sons of the first Duke of Guise—Francis, the second duke, and Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine—were distinguished no less by their talents and personal attainments than by their lofty birth. The duke was an able military commander, and had gained universal popularity by his gallant defence of Metz against the emperor, his recapture of Calais from the English, and other brilliant exploits. His brother, the Cardinal, possessed a character abounding with splendid qualities, which, however, were darkly shaded by strange inconsistencies, if not by scandalous vices. He was a dexterous, though not a profound, politician ; an erudite scholar, an accomplished theologian, a practised orator, and gifted with singularly attractive manners. On the other hand, he was inordinately vain ; intensely selfish ; an adept in the arts of dissimulation, which he used without scruple ; and generally believed to be irregular in his private morals. Born in 1524, Charles of Lorraine was preferred at the age of fifteen to the

* See La Place, *Commentaire de l'Etat de Religion*, Liv. ii.

Archbishopric of Reims;—a somewhat gross specimen of the abuse of Church patronage by the Crown since the Concordat. On the accession of Henry II. he was made a member of the Council of State, and was soon afterwards elevated to the Conclave by Pope Paul III. In addition to the see of Reims, the Cardinal held *in commendam* that of Metz, besides several rich abbeys. His ecclesiastical revenue was reckoned at 300,000 livres (equal to about three times that amount according to the present value of money). His private fortune, moreover, was considerable.

The influence of this great dignitary was paramount with the clergy, who looked up to him with boundless confidence as the all-powerful protector of their interests. The ecclesiastical administration, and indeed the whole internal government of France, was in his hands.*

The Cardinal had accustomèd himself—like other famous statesmen before and since his time,—to identify the public welfare with his own tenure of the reins of power; and if he hated and persecuted the Huguenots, it was not so much because they were heretics, as because they were his political adversaries. Not that Charles of Lorraine was at all deficient in zeal for Catholicism; but with him the supremacy of the Guises was the *first* object, the supremacy of Catholicism was the *second*. The popular pamphleteers of the day represented him to the multitude as a special instrument raised up by Providence for the defence and preservation of the Faith; hence his severities against the Huguenots passed with the world for proofs of ardent devotedness to the cause of religion, whereas they resulted mainly from a reckless determination to trample down and annihilate the party which opposed his monopoly of power.

Henry II., at the instigation of the Cardinal, now embarked in a systematic course of fierce persecution. An attempt was made, in 1555, to enforce the execution of all ecclesiastical sentences against heretics without permitting any appeal to the civil magistrate. This was firmly resisted by the heads of the parliament of Paris, who maintained, in a remonstrance to

* *Mémoires de Castelnau*, Liv. i. chap. 1. Auvert, *Vies des Hommes Illustres: Biograph. Universelle*.

the king, that it belonged to the temporal courts to adjudicate finally in all causes without exception; though they acknowledged the right of the spiritual authorities to define what constituted the crime of heresy. The secular judges had hitherto been relentless in condemning the Calvinists; and it is a remarkable proof of their altered tone of feeling with regard to the great controversy of the day, that on this occasion they deprecated rigorous measures, and even proceeded to lecture the sovereign and his ministers for their intolerance. "We take the liberty to remark," said they, "that, inasmuch as the infliction of these penalties has hitherto been ineffectual to correct error, it would be more reasonable to imitate the example of the Primitive Church, which, instead of employing fire and sword for the defence of religion, relied for that purpose on purity of doctrine and the saintly lives of its chief pastors. Let the bishops be more sedulous in personally superintending the flock committed to them; let them faithfully preach the word of God, or at least take care that this duty is conscientiously discharged by others; let them never promote to the priesthood any but men whom they know to be able and willing to fulfil their ministry without resorting to the services of substitutes. Such measures would have a happy effect, we doubt not, in arresting the progress of heresy; but if these are neglected, the most peremptory laws and edicts will assuredly fail to supply their place." This spirited appeal was successful, and the execution of the edict was suspended.*

The Cardinal, thus foiled, next applied himself to the task of resuscitating in France the terrible tribunal of the Inquisition. The machinery of the "Holy Office" was still extant, and scarcely differed from the original form in which it had been cast by Innocent III. and the Dominicans; but, practically, it was obsolete and powerless. The object of the Cardinal was to revive it in accordance with the extreme type which it had assumed in Spain under the fostering hands of Philip II., the success of whose crusade against heresy was mainly due to its agency. A bull was procured from Paul IV., in 1557, nominating the Cardinals of Lorraine, Bourbon, and Chatillon, grand

* De Thou, *Hist. Univ.*, Liv. xvi.

Inquisitors in France, and empowering them to hold courts in every diocese, from whose decision there was to be no appeal; the secular arm was simply to carry their sentences into effect. A "bed of justice" was held to enforce the registration of this stern decree of the Pope; but the Parliament, in the very act of acquiescence, took care to strip it of its most tyrannical provision. They stipulated that, in the case of laymen, the constitutional resource of an "*appel comme d'abus*" from the Inquisitorial tribunals should continue to be available.*

This second defeat only served to impel the king and his advisers to still more odious extremities. By this time the "new learning" had made several proselytes on the judicial bench, and the consequence was that the proceedings of the different courts of Parliament were frequently at variance. The Grande Chambre, in which the judges were strict Catholics, condemned the Huguenots without mercy; the "Tournelle" was more lenient, admitted extenuating circumstances, and rarely or never inflicted the punishment of death.† At one of the periodical meetings of the Chambers, called "*Mercuriales*,"‡ the whole question of the treatment of offences against religion was discussed at length; when it appeared that the majority of the magistrates were in favour of a mild interpretation of the existing laws. Upon this the Cardinal of Lorraine urged the king to interpose with a high hand in support of his own edicts; representing that such a step was especially necessary at that moment, in order to vindicate his zeal for the Church in the eyes of the King of Spain, with whom he had just concluded the treaty of Château-Cambresis. Swayed by these counsels, Henry, on the 10th of June, 1559, proceeded in person to the parliament, where a memorable scene ensued. The magistrates having been invited to declare their sentiments, Anne Dubourg,

* Isambert, *Anciennes Loix Françaises*, tom. xiii. p. 494.

† The "Tournelle" was the ordinary criminal court of the Parliament of Paris; so named because the judges composing it were supplied by rotation (*à tour*) by the other chambers.

‡ The "*Mercuriales*," so called from being held on Wednesday (*dies Mercurii*), were meetings of all the magis-

trates belonging to the Parliament, for the purpose of reviewing, and, if necessary, censuring and correcting, the judicial acts of the six months preceding. Originally they took place every month; latterly twice a year, after the Easter and autumn vacations. From this practice the word "*mercuriale*" obtained the general sense of a lecture or reprimand.

one of the clerical councillors,* a man of distinguished family and character, made an indiscreet and irritating speech, in the course of which he alluded, by no means obscurely, to the scandal of the King's immoral life. Another councillor, Louis Dufaur, followed in the same strain, and declaimed forcibly against the abuses which disgraced the Church. The advice of the majority was that the king should employ all his influence to procure forthwith a free Œcumenical Council; and that, meanwhile, penal proceedings against heretics should be suspended, and liberty of conscience proclaimed throughout the realm.

Henry, in a transport of rage, caused Dubourg and Dufaur to be arrested on the spot. Three of their colleagues were seized at their own houses the same day; three more saved themselves by flight. A special Commission, presided over by the Bishop of Paris, was appointed to try the prisoners for heresy; and Anne Dubourg, the most conspicuous of their number, was selected as the victim. The king, wild with passion, protested that he would, with his own eyes, see him burnt at the stake before a week was past.†

Henry was not permitted to fulfil this savage threat. His own life was cut short by an accidental injury at a tournament, and he expired on the 10th of July, 1559.

Under his youthful successor, Francis II., the power of the Guises rose to its highest pitch. The Queen-Consort, Mary Stuart, was their niece, daughter of their sister Mary of Lorraine. Her empire over her feeble husband was unbounded; and she, in her turn, was completely under the dominion of her uncles.

The religious agitation now increased alarmingly. One of the presidents of the Parliament, belonging to the party opposed to Dubourg, was assassinated in the street at noon day; and the Huguenots, though without direct proof, were credited with the crime. This outrage sealed the fate of Dubourg. His trial was hastened; he was capitally condemned, and, after

* A certain number of "conseillers-clercs" were attached to each of the Parliamentary Courts, with the exception of the "Tournelle."

† La Place, *Estat de la Religion*, Liv. i. De Thou, *Hist. Univ.*, Liv. xxii, *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. i.

vainly appealing from the sentence, was executed on the Place de Grève.

Upon the death of Dubourg there followed almost immediately an explosion of the various elements of strife which had long threatened the peace of society in France. The treasonable enterprise called the conspiracy of Amboise (March 1560), though undertaken in the name of religion, was a general combination of all parties who, for whatever reason, were hostile to the government of the Guises. Its principal cause, however, was undoubtedly religious partisanship. The Huguenot leaders, with a view to remove any scruples of conscience which might perplex their followers, obtained opinions from certain lawyers and divines of their persuasion, to the effect that when a sovereign, too young to govern in person, is held in bondage by usurping ministers, it is lawful to deliver him from their yoke by force of arms, provided the step be sanctioned by the princes of the blood or the Estates of the realm.* On the strength of this assurance, measures were concerted for taking possession of the Château of Blois, where the court was sojourning, and seizing the persons of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who were either to be put to death, imprisoned, or banished from France. The young king was then to be placed under the tutelage of the Bourbons, who were to succeed to the management of affairs. The States-General were to be summoned forthwith; effective reforms, civil and ecclesiastical, were to be inaugurated, and complete toleration, independence, and equality were to be secured to the "new religion."

The plot was betrayed at the last moment to the Guises, and was defeated with ease in the very act of execution. A ruthless butchery of the unfortunate prisoners followed; and the insurrectionary spirit was quelled for the moment by the severity of these acts of vengeance.

From the conspiracy of Amboise may be dated the commencement of the miserable "Wars of Religion." And the reader will do well to take special note of the fact that the cause of the Reformation was thus necessarily identified in the eyes

* De Thou, Liv. xxv. *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. i. ann. 1560. Th. Beza, *Hist. Eccles.*, Liv. iii.

of the Government, and of the great mass of the nation, with that of political disaffection and sedition.

This character—impressed upon it by the misguided counsels and fanatical excesses of its friends—it never afterwards lost; indeed, the subsequent course of events developed it more distinctly. Those who study dispassionately the records of the time can scarcely avoid the conclusion that it was the turbulent and offensive attitude maintained by the Huguenots towards the civil power, even more than any prejudice arising from religion, that brought about their decisive overthrow as a party, and the ultimate triumph of the ancient faith.

Upon the death of Francis II. (Dec. 5, 1560) a remarkable change took place in the posture of affairs. The supreme authority passed from the hands of the Guises into those of the Queen-Mother, Catherine de Medicis,—a personage who had hitherto been of no importance in the state, and whose real character was unknown. The Guises, though not altogether deprived of power, were reduced to a secondary position. The Bourbon princes,—who had only just escaped condign punishment as traitors by the opportune demise of the crown,—were now admitted to the council-board, and invested with high dignities. The Constable Montmorency and his nephew the Admiral de Coligny re-appeared at Court, and were received with distinguished honour. Catherine's policy (well worthy of her fellow-countryman Machiavelli, whose writings probably suggested it) was to balance the great rival houses against each other, allowing neither to preponderate, and thus to secure the real sovereignty to herself and her immediate confidants.

There existed in France, from the earliest days of the Reforming movement, a party disposed to moderate counsels; averse to persecution, anxious for practical improvements on a broad and safe basis, attached generally to the ancient Church, but at the same time strongly opposed to the pretensions of Papal absolutism. This was known by the name of the "Tiers-parti." It was the same which developed afterwards into the famous faction of the "Politiques," and played so decisive a part in the struggles of the "League." On the accession of Charles IX., the Tiers-parti found itself suddenly in the ascendant. At its head was one of the most enlightened and disinterested men of the time, Michel de l'Hôpital, who, by the favour of the

Queen-Mother, and without opposition from the Guises, had just been created Chancellor of France. On assuming that high office, De l'Hôpital avowed himself a friend to toleration, and willing to make reasonable concessions to the professors of the "new religion." As a first step he procured a meeting of Notables at Fontainebleau, where it was resolved to convoke without delay the States-General of the realm, and also a National Council, in which the Huguenots were to be fairly represented.*

The States met at Orleans on the 13th of December. The Chancellor, in his opening speech, dwelt earnestly and eloquently on the duty of mutual forbearance, patience, and charity; recommended that invidious party names, such as Lutheran, Huguenot, Papist, be for ever abolished; inveighed with grave severity against those who sought to propagate religious opinion by sedition and physical force; hinted that the restoration of discipline among the clergy would be found one of the most effective weapons against heresy; pointed out that theological controversies could only be decided by a Council; and pledged himself that no exertion should be spared on the part of the Government to procure the application of that remedy to existing evils.

The fruit of the deliberations which ensued was the celebrated "Ordonnance of Orleans." Many of its provisions were identical with those which had been demanded by the minority of the Parliamentary magistrates at the "Mercuriale" two years before;—a proof of the rapid growth of the tolerant school of opinion represented by l'Hôpital. It proclaimed an amnesty for the past, the chief conspirators of Amboise being alone excepted. Prisoners for religious offences were restored to liberty, and those who had been banished on like grounds were authorized to return to France, provided they would conduct themselves like good Catholics in future. If they declined this condition, they might

* This expedient was warmly advocated by Charles de Marillac, Archbishop of Vienne, a man of remarkable foresight and sagacity. "Notre mal nous presse si fort," he said, "le feu estant allumé en plusieurs endroits du royaume, que nous ne pouvons attendre un remède esloigné et incertain; tout

ainsi qu'un malade de fiebvre continue, ou autre maladie aiguë, ne peut attendre qu'on soit allé quérir un medecin bien loin, lequel on n'est certain encores qu'il viendra. Il faut donc venir au Concile National."—La Place, *Commentaire sur l'Etat de la Religion*, Liv. iii.

sell their property and take up their residence abroad. A subsequent edict enacted that heresy should not be punishable henceforth with any severer penalty than banishment; and six months later (January, 1562) all penalties against Huguenots were provisionally suspended, until the promulgation of the final sentence of a General Council.

The States of Orleans legislated likewise in the right direction on the all-important subject of ecclesiastical elections. It was decreed that, on the vacancy of an episcopal see, the bishops of the province and the chapter of the Cathedral, in conjunction with twelve deputies of the nobility and twelve of the commonalty of the diocese, should present the names of three well-qualified candidates to the King, of whom he should select one for the appointment.* That such a statute should not only have passed the three Chambers, but should also have been accepted by the Crown, is a fact well worthy of note, since it amounted to nothing less than an abolition of the Concordat. But the concession was merely nominal. The new regulation was tacitly set aside, and the sovereign continued to bestow episcopal sees at his pleasure as heretofore.

The Chancellor was earnestly bent upon carrying a further instalment of his scheme of conciliation,—namely, the assembling of a National Council. What he desired under this name was a conference between the leading divines of the two communions, for the amicable discussion of the points in controversy;—a step which, he trusted, might lead to some temporary arrangement by way of compromise, and thus pave the way for eventual reunion. There can be no doubt that he regarded it also in another point of view—as an instrument which might be useful in detaching the French clergy more and more from the Court of Rome, and accustoming them to see critical questions affecting domestic interests determined independently of foreign intervention.

The news of these strange projects in France excited serious disquietude at Rome. The reigning Pope, Pius IV., no sooner discovered that Catherine and her advisers were in earnest in preparing to hold a Gallican Council, than he resolved to traverse it by recalling into action the dormant synod of Trent

* Isambert, *Anciennes Lois Françaises*, tom. xiv. p. 64.

—a step which, indeed, he seems to have meditated from the beginning of his Pontificate. That the Protestants, who were every day increasing in numbers and power, would recognize such an assembly, and submit to its decrees, was no longer within the bounds of probability; but it might be possible to avert, by this expedient, the scandal to be apprehended from a meeting in which the most venerable dogmas of the Catholic faith were to be rudely questioned by irreverent schismatics, intruded for that purpose into a position of equality with the most dignified prelates of the Church. “If every prince,” cried the indignant Pontiff, addressing the French ambassador, “were to take upon himself to hold Councils in his own dominions, the Church would soon become a scene of universal confusion.” He also complained bitterly that the French government had not consulted him previously as to the projected synod, requesting his permission to hold it, instead of convoking it first and acquainting him with their intentions afterwards.*

The resumption of the Tridentine Council placed the promoters of the Gallican scheme on the horns of an anxious dilemma. If they persisted in their plan, they set themselves in open opposition to the Holy See, and to the first principles of Catholicism; if they abandoned it, they relinquished a measure which they believed to be of the deepest national importance, in favour of one from which they expected little or no practical advantage.

A middle course was finally adopted. It was agreed that the National Council should not be celebrated under that obnoxious name; but the bishops and clergy were invited to confer with certain chosen members of the Calvinist body, in order to ventilate freely, and if possible to adjust, disputed questions; without trenching, however, on the character and functions of a synod representing the universal Church. The Cardinal of Lorraine declared in favour of the project in this modified shape; partly, it is said, from motives of vanity, that he might have an opportunity of exhibiting his powers in demolishing the heretics,† and partly because he hoped that by skilful

* Fra Paolo, *Hist. du C. de Trente*, Liv. v. § 53.

† Varillas, *Hist. de Charles IX.*, tom. i. p. 97.

management, the inconsistencies and divisions between the different sects of Protestants, especially between the Lutherans of Germany and the Calvinists of France, might be so strongly brought out in the course of the debates, as to shake the credit of the whole system of the Reformation in the public mind. In the prospect, moreover, of an appeal to arms, which manifestly was not far distant, it was an important point to separate the Huguenots from their brethren of the Augsburg Confession, and thus deprive them of any advantage which they might have gained by coalition. With this object the Guises entered into secret negotiation with the Protestant Duke of Wirtemberg; and the Cardinal is even said to have offered to sign the Lutheran profession of faith, and to obtain its recognition in France, provided the Duke and other princes of the Empire would agree to support their pretensions and policy.*

The "Colloquy of Poissy" was appointed for the 19th of August, 1561. Just before it assembled, Catherine de Medicis addressed a remarkable letter to the Pope, in which she explained her motives, enlarged on the many notorious abuses which infested the Church, and pointed out the concessions which, in her judgment, ought to be made to the Reformers, for the purpose of re-establishing, if it might be, unity and peace. She stated that the numbers and importance of the separatists were now so great, that it was hopeless to think of coercing them by rigorous legislation or by force of arms. The party was strong among the nobility and magistracy; it was constantly on the increase, and was formidable throughout the kingdom. Nevertheless it was consoling to reflect that the Huguenots were not Anabaptists, or free-thinkers, or propagators of monstrous and pestilent opinions. They held the Apostles' Creed, and adhered to the first six General Councils. This being so, it was felt by many Catholics that they ought not to be violently expelled from the pale of the Church; that their difference of sentiment on certain topics might be tolerated without danger; and that such a course might even tend to facilitate a reconciliation between the Latin and the Oriental communions. The Queen went on to specify the measures

* See *Preuves de la Satyre Menippée*, tom. iii. pp. 6, 15, 26. Also Anquetil, *Esprit de la Ligue*, tom. i. p. 113.

which she considered desirable towards regaining the seceders, and confirming those who still remained in the fold. She recommended frequent interviews between those of the two parties who were most eminent for their learning and their love of peace; diligence on the part of the clergy in exhortations to charity, brotherly-kindness, and concord; careful abstinence from injurious language and disputatious habits. She suggested, further, that the use of images, since it was forbidden in Scripture, might be advantageously abolished; that the ceremony of exorcism in baptism, and other like superstitions, might be omitted; that the Holy Eucharist ought to be given to the laity under both kinds; that prayers and psalms should be recited in public in the vulgar tongue; and that the Feast of Corpus Christi (then recently instituted) should cease to be observed, inasmuch as it had caused widespread offence.*

Such language, from such a quarter, at such a moment, alarmed and irritated the Holy Father. It sounded as if the French Court had resolved to take the concerns of religion into its own hands, without either seeking directions from the See of S. Peter, or consulting the supreme legislature of Christendom. A special legate, Hippolito d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, was despatched in all haste to France, with instructions to frustrate the conference, if possible. But he arrived too late.

After much preliminary negociation, the Colloquy was opened on the 9th of September, in the presence of the young king, the Queen-Mother, the princes of the blood, the great officers of the Crown, and a brilliant audience.† Cardinal de Tournon, Archbishop of Lyons, presided; five other Cardinals

* Fra Paolo, Liv. v. § 72. Varillas, *Hist. de Charles IX.*, tom. i. p. 103. The letter is said to have been drawn up by the Bishop of Valence, Jean de Montluc, a prelate well known to lean towards the Reformed opinions.

† The contemporary accounts of this meeting vary considerably. That of Claude d'Espence—*Acta Colloquii Posiacci*—is probably the most trustworthy. We have, besides, the version published by the Huguenots, "Ample discours des actes de Poissy," which seems to have been followed by De Thou, and by the compiler of the

Mémoires de Condé. The official record of the proceedings may be seen in the first vol. of the *Collection des Procès-verbaux des Assemblées générales du Clergé de France*, which commences from this date. The Colloquy was preceded by a proclamation, or edict, giving permission to all the king's subjects, of whatever condition, to attend at Poissy, with a promise of impartial hearing for those who might wish to address the assembly, and a pledge of safety in going and returning. See *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. i. p. 41.

attended, together with forty prelates, a numerous phalanx of doctors of the Sorbonne, and many deputies from the chapters and conventual bodies. The Reformers were represented by twelve of their most eminent ministers, headed by Theodore Beza, the favourite disciple and confidential friend of Calvin. Peter Martyr, who was reckoned the ablest theologian of the party, was likewise present.

The Chancellor de l'Hôpital commenced the proceedings* in a speech which by no means pleased the Catholics, since he drew a parallel between the advantages of a National and an Œcumenical Council, to the disparagement of the latter. The fathers summoned to Trent, he said, being for the most part strangers to France, could not be intimately acquainted with the evils which required redress; and, moreover, would be obliged to defer to the personal will and pleasure of the Pope; whereas an assembly of French divines was directly interested by ties of natural relationship, by local experience, and by patriotic motives, in healing the wounds under which the country groaned. There was no reason, he observed, why there should be any opposition or collision between the one Council and the other; instances were on record of two Councils being in session at the same time; and it had even happened that mistakes committed by a General Council had been rectified by one of more modest pretensions.† Cardinal de Tournon demanded that a copy of this discourse should be furnished to him in writing; but an excuse was made for non-compliance. It is supposed that he designed to call the Chancellor to account for it at some future opportunity. ‡

Theodore Beza was then invited to speak. He entered into an elaborate exposition of the doctrinal system of the Reformers, as set forth in the "Institutions" of Calvin. His tone was calm, conciliating, and impressive. In treating of the Eucharist, he employed language which at first seemed almost tantamount to the Catholic terminology on that vital point. But on further explanation it appeared that the Presence which he

* *Continuat. de Fleury*, Liv. clvii. 4.

† This was an allusion to the Council of Paris in A.D. 360, which rejected the heretical confession of faith propounded by the Council of Ariminum in 359,

where the Arians had for the moment triumphed.

‡ *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. ii. p. 492. Varillas, *Hist. de Charles IX.* tom. i. p. 124.

recognized was subjective only; depending, not on the supernatural virtue of the Sacrament, but on the power of faith; to be sought, not in any change of the substance of the elements, but in the heart of the devout communicant. Beza repudiated both Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation. "The glorified Body of Christ," he contended, "is in heaven, and cannot be elsewhere." He allowed that by the Sacrament we are really made partakers of Christ; "but with respect to actual locality," continued Beza, forgetting for a moment his discretion, "Christ is as far distant from the consecrated bread and wine as the highest heaven is remote from earth."

At this unfortunate sally the Catholics could not restrain their indignation. "He blasphemes!" they exclaimed. Cardinal de Tournon rose hastily, and, in a voice trembling with emotion, begged that Beza might not be allowed to proceed further, for fear of poisoning the tender mind of the young monarch. He obtained leave, however, though with difficulty, to bring his speech to a conclusion; and, after a few more words of angry remonstrance from the Cardinal, the assembly separated in a state of agitation.*

At the second meeting, several days afterwards, the Cardinal of Lorraine replied to Beza in a discourse well worthy of his high reputation both as an orator and a controversialist. He confined himself to two points—the authority of the Church and the Real Presence in the Eucharist. From the unvarying testimony of tradition to the Catholic dogmas, he proved the infallibility of the "*Ecclesia docens*" in her decisions founded upon it. All doctrinal controversy, he argued, turns upon the right interpretation of Holy Scripture. How then is the sense of Scripture to be ascertained, unless there be an authoritative tribunal to which appeal may be made continually; a living voice to adjudicate between truth and error as each successive emergency arises? What could ever be sufficient to justify Christians in rejecting the guidance of such an infallible teacher? And then, dexterously resorting to the "*argumentum ad hominem*," he reminded the Huguenots that they had been baptized into the communion of the Roman Church, had pro-

* De Thou, *Hist. Univ.* Liv. xxviii. La Place, *Commentaire de l'Etat de Religion*, Liv. vi.

fessed its creed, and obeyed its authority, until certain proceedings on the part of its rulers in recent times had chanced to give them offence.

With respect to the Eucharist, the Cardinal exposed the contradiction into which Beza had fallen, by asserting that we are really partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ in that Sacrament, while he maintained at the same time that Christ, being locally in heaven, cannot be in any other place. It was far more philosophical and more reasonable, he contended, to believe with Catholics, that the Body of Christ, which is no longer a natural but a spiritual and immortal body, subject to conditions of existence of which we know absolutely nothing, may be present in many places at one and the same time. The doctrine of the Real Presence, as held in the Church of Rome, he proceeded to establish by proofs drawn with great ability from Holy Scripture and the principal Fathers.*

The sitting was now adjourned. Those which followed were not held in the presence of the King and Court, but were comparatively private. Theodore Beza attempted to justify the position of the separatists from the Church, by distinguishing between the succession of persons and the succession of true doctrine, and arguing that the former is of no avail except in conjunction with the latter. Being thereupon asked who had ordained him to the ministry, he replied that there is an extraordinary vocation to that office, in addition to the ordinary; just as there is a Church of the predestined and elect, besides that outward communion which consists of all Christians indiscriminately. Both general and particular Councils, he affirmed, have repeatedly fallen into error; for an assembly of bishops is not less fallible than any other body of men. Yet God will always preserve in His Church a certain number of faithful witnesses, either greater or smaller, who will hand down the knowledge of saving truth.

Claude d'Espence and Claude de Saintes, two of the most eminent controversial scholars of the time, refuted without difficulty these paradoxes of the Calvinist divine, which, it must

* This speech is given at full length in the *Collection des Procès-verbaux des Assemblées Générales du Clergé de France*, tom. i., "Pièces justificatives," No. 2.

be remembered, were not then so trite and hackneyed as they appear to readers of the nineteenth century.

The Cardinal of Lorraine, recurring to the crucial subject of the Eucharist, now enquired whether Beza and his colleagues were willing to subscribe the article of the Confession of Augsburg relating to that doctrine? Beza, in reply to this insidious question (the purpose of which he penetrated), demanded whether the Cardinal and the other prelates were themselves prepared to adopt it? If they had authority to make the proposition in the name of the Catholics as a body, he hailed it as a happy omen, since in that case the tenet of Transubstantiation would necessarily be expunged from the Roman creed; but if they would not accept the Lutheran article themselves, with what consistency could they tender it as a test of orthodoxy to others? This keen rejoinder disconcerted and provoked the Cardinal; and the rest of the debate seems to have been little better than a scene of indecorous altercation.*

Lainez, the famous General of the Jesuits, who had come to France in company with the Cardinal-legate of Ferrara, assailed the Huguenots with vituperative epithets, and even rebuked the Queen-Mother to her face for suffering the Conference to take place. Beza retorted in a style of raillery still more exasperating.

Though it was clear, after this, that the affair could not terminate successfully, it was resolved to make a final effort of approximation, and for this purpose, a select committee of ten persons was named from the most moderate members of each party. After some days of negotiation, these divines drew up a formulary upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the terms of which it was hoped that all sincere friends of peace in the rival communions might be induced to concur. Its language, of course, was to some extent ambiguous, in order that each party might be at liberty to construe it in accordance with their own prepossessions. The following was the draft agreed upon:—

“We confess that Jesus Christ, in His Holy Supper, presents, gives, and exhibits to us the true substance of His Body and Blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit; and that we receive

* Varillas, *Hist. de Charles IX.*, tom. i, p. 161.

and eat sacramentally, spiritually, and by faith, that very Body which died for us, that we may be bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh. And inasmuch as faith, resting on the word of God, makes present things which are promised, so that thereby we receive actually the true and natural Body and Blood of our Lord by the power of the Holy Ghost, in that sense we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper.”*

With the help of this evasive phraseology an understanding might possibly have been effected, provided both sides could have agreed to accept the statement in a general sense, as an article of peace, intentionally excluding technicalities, and not to be too narrowly criticised. But its authors must have been conscious that, if submitted by Catholic divines to the rigorous test of scientific definition, its failure was inevitable.

The result showed that the whole enterprise was simply hopeless. The doctors of the Sorbonne, being appealed to, rejected the formulary as “captious, insufficient, and heretical.” Upon this the prelates put forth a counter statement, asserting the Real Presence by transubstantiation of the elements, according to the authorized tradition of the Church. This they forwarded to the queen, with a request that Beza and his associates might be ordered to signify their acceptance of it without further demur, under pain of being proscribed as heretics and banished from the kingdom.

This peremptory demand was equivalent to a rupture of the negotiation; and the Conference of Poissy thus terminated without satisfactory result.

It was a woeful disappointment to De l'Hôpital and his friends. They now saw the utter futility of attempting to accommodate matters by means of a National Council; nor was the augury at all more promising with regard to the action of the General Council about to reassemble at Trent, in which lay the sole remaining chance of a peaceful solution. The irreconcilable discrepancies between the two great Protestant denominations had been exposed with damaging ability; and the disputants, instead of settling the conditions of reunion, separated with feelings of increased estrangement.

Other circumstances concurred to augment the mortification

* Th. Beza, *Hist. des Egl. Ref.* i. 608. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clvii. 24.
VOL. I. I.

of those who had been most sanguine in promoting the late negotiations. The King of Navarre, yielding to the fascinating rhetoric of the Cardinal of Lorraine, and to the political bribes of Philip of Spain, abandoned the Huguenots and returned to the bosom of the Church of Rome. It was at this juncture, too, that the Jesuits first obtained a legal footing in France. Their General, Lainez, procured an arrêt from the Parliament, referring the question of their admission to the prelates assembled at Poissy.* That body decided in their favour, though with certain qualifications; whereupon the courts of law registered their letters of reception, and they were put into possession of a college at Paris which had been bequeathed to them by Guillaume Duprat, Bishop of Clermont; an institution which soon acquired celebrity under the name of the Collège de Clermont.†

The state of things now grew rapidly worse in France. The Queen-Mother, under the guidance of De l'Hôpital, persevered for some time longer in her efforts to soothe and conciliate the sectaries; and the edict of Saint Germain, published in January, 1562, was a further step than any which had yet been taken towards establishing complete liberty of conscience.‡ But it was instantly met by a vehement ultra-Catholic reaction. The "Tiers-parti" lost the control of affairs, which was seized by a menacing coalition headed by the Constable Montmorency, the Duke of Guise, and Marshal de St. André. Their alliance became known by the ill-omened title of the "Triumvirate." Within three months afterwards, the long-suppressed violence of parties burst forth in the accidental rencontre called the "Massacre of Vassy," and the flames of civil strife were forthwith kindled throughout the land.

Upon the close of the proceedings at Poissy, the Gallican prelates received the king's commands to prepare to set out for Trent. The Council had been opened there *pro formâ* several months previously, but had been unable to commence operations, on account of its manifest inadequacy, in point of numbers and importance, to represent the Catholic world. The attendance of bishops gradually increased, and the first session

* *Contîn. de Fleury*, Liv. clvii. 32. † Dulaure, *Hist. de Paris*, tom. iv. p. 219.

‡ *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. iii. p. 8.

under Pius IV. (counted as the seventeenth) was held on the 18th of January, 1562.

There were those in France who still cherished a vague hope that the collective wisdom of the Fathers of the Church might devise the means of a safe reformation, and that a happy reunion might thus succeed to the calamities of schism. But such visions were altogether baseless. No mere concessions on matters of ceremonial and outward discipline, such as the grant of Communion in both kinds to the laity, or the celebration of Divine service in the vulgar tongue, would have sufficed at this moment to win back the wanderers to the fold, even had the Council been willing to consent to them. Every day's experience proved more plainly that the gulf which separated the two systems was too broad and deep to be thus easily bridged over; and that the innovations of Protestantism amounted in sober truth, as well as in popular parlance, to a "new religion."

It was felt, by the deepest thinkers on both sides, that the controversy had passed beyond the region of calm discussion and amicable adjustment. All that remained to be done at Trent, as things then stood, was to declare the mind of the Church, definitely and positively, upon the points at issue, and so to provide a standard of belief to which Catholics might appeal thenceforward as a final and supreme authority.

The Court of France, nevertheless, professed to be full of hope for the future if the Tridentine fathers could be induced to give way on certain minor questions of ecclesiastical polity and ritual order; and these, accordingly, were embodied in the instructions given to the ambassadors of Charles IX.—Saint Gelais de Lansac, Arnaud Du Ferrier, and Dufaur de Pibrac—all magistrates of high position, and strongly attached to the party headed by De l'Hôpital.

They were charged to demand, in the first place, that the Council should be explicitly declared to be a *new* assembly, and not a mere continuation of the old. Special stress was laid upon this distinction, for the sake of avoiding offence to the Protestants; who, having denied the legitimacy of the earlier proceedings under Popes Paul and Julius, could hardly be expected to submit to the same tribunal which they had formerly rejected. The reader will remember, moreover, that Henry II. had entered a protest, in his own name and that of the Gallican Church,

against all synodal acts at Trent posterior to the XIIth session, in September, 1551. As a second point, they were to urge that the deliberations of the Council must be *free*; and that no reservation should be made, as was the case on former occasions, of "the good pleasure of the Pope and his legates." The decisions at which the fathers might arrive were not to be submitted to the judgment of the Pope; on the contrary, it was to be clearly understood that his Holiness had no power to alter or dispense with them in the very least particular, and that he himself was bound to obey them. Further, inasmuch as the existing troubles had arisen from the flagrant abuses prevalent among the clergy, and from the general decay of discipline, the ambassadors were to recommend the Council to apply itself forthwith to the thorough reformation of the Church, as well in its head as in its members, conformably with the well-known decrees of the Council of Constance. With a view to such reformation, the Pope should be requested not to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of bishops, abbots, or parochial clergy; the disposal of benefices should be left to the ordinary collators. The Pope ought plainly to renounce for the future the prerogative of dispensing with the decrees of Councils. Annates, and all other taxes payable by ecclesiastics to the Court of Rome, should be abolished; and official documents issuing from the Roman chancery ought to be furnished without charge. Archbishops and bishops ought to be bound to residence within their dioceses, without exemption. None should be advanced to the episcopate unless duly qualified as to age and other canonical requirements. Newly-appointed prelates should be admitted and consecrated according to the rules laid down by the Councils. Lastly, the royal envoys were enjoined to keep vigilant watch over the privileges and liberties of the Gallican Church; and in the event of any attack being made upon them, they were to protest against it forthwith, and send information to the king.*

It was on the 26th of May, 1562, that the representatives of his most Christian Majesty made their first public appearance at Trent. Pibrac addressed the Council on this occasion in a speech of considerable ingenuity, though of questionable taste. He

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clviii. 60.

enlarged on the manifold snares and artifices by which the great Tempter would seek to blind the understanding and corrupt the hearts of those then assembled in consultation on the affairs of the Church. Self-interest, servility, sloth, worldly-mindedness, duplicity—such, according to this unceremonious monitor, were the special dangers which beset them. He warned them not to mar the good work before them by yielding to these weaknesses. Reform was indispensable; and that reform, he gave them to understand, must commence with themselves. Other Councils, he went on to remark, had been held both in Italy and Germany, which, unhappily, had proved useless to the Church; and perhaps for this reason among others, that they had not enjoyed the necessary freedom of action. To prevent this in the present instance, the fathers should remember that they were individually responsible as judges of all the questions which might be brought before them; that they were bound to give their opinion according to the dictates of conscience, without listening to prejudice or passion; and that they must not invoke the inspiration of the Holy Ghost from any other quarter than Heaven. This last hint was a sufficiently plain allusion to the pressure which was said to be exercised upon the Council by the Pope. The same insinuation was afterwards repeated in coarser language by De Lansac, who, in a letter to his colleague at Rome, begged that no ground might be given for a rumour which he had heard, that the Holy Spirit was despatched from Rome to Trent in the courier's portmanteau.* After some further admonitions in the same tone of covert raillery, Pibrac concluded by urging the legates to declare officially that the present was no mere continuation of the Council begun under Paul III., and carried on by Julius III. in the midst of tumult and disorder—but an entirely new assembly, convoked freely, legitimately, and according to ancient usage, with the consent of the princes of Christendom; an assembly which would doubtless be attended by deputies from the Reformed States of Germany, qualified by their learning and talent to represent the views and interests of those who were striving for the purification of the Church.†

* See his letter to M. de Lisle, May 29, 1562; in *Le Plat*, tom. v. p. 169.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clix. 16.

The Spaniards, and others who had been engaged in the earlier proceedings of the Council, were much offended by this harangue. The legates replied to it with dignity and moderation; assuring the ambassadors that the Council was by no means disposed to submit to dictation, in whatever shape it might be attempted; that it was fully resolved to be guided by no principles save those of honour and duty, as the result would prove in due time.* They had no authority, they said, to make any alteration in the "indiction" of the Council; their office was to preside in it, according to the terms of the Pope's bull, confirmed by the assent of the fathers. After this the question about the "continuation" of the Council was dropped. Indeed it had been mooted without reason, inasmuch as the bull of indiction was so worded as to admit the view for which the French contended, though without positively excluding the contrary construction.†

The Gallican episcopate, meanwhile, was still absent from Trent, or slenderly represented there by the Bishop of Paris, Eustache du Bellai, and two or three of his colleagues. The religious commotions which distracted France were alleged as the cause of their non-arrival; but, considering that the Council had been convened for the very purpose of appeasing these commotions, and that the condition of France was the principal subject of solicitude and alarm in the ecclesiastical world, there was no great force in this excuse. The real reasons which withheld the French from proceeding to Trent appear to have been these:—first, they shrank from the measures of practical reform affecting their own order, which were known to be in contemplation, and of the necessity of which they were fully conscious; and next, they found it difficult to decide what line of action to adopt amid the mazy intrigues and conflicting interests which abounded in the Council. They were far from being agreed among themselves as to some of the most important questions in debate, particularly as to the policy of making con-

* "Apertè prædicat, se cujusvis voluntatem, potentiam, aut cupiditatem, sacrosanctæ Synodi dignitati et auctoritati perpetuò posthabituram."—Le Plat, tom. v. p. 183. Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 1180.

† "Ils se sont accordés . . . de

paroles ambiguës et équivoques, qui semblent suffire pour la présente concorde, en ces termes: celebratio Concilii sublatâ quâcunque suspensione."
—M. de Lisle au Roy de France, Jan. 25, 1562-3. Le Plat, tom. v. p. 16.

cessions to the Huguenots. Even the sentiments of the Cardinal of Lorraine were on many points ambiguous, and the greatest uncertainty prevailed as to the part which he might actually play in the deliberations of the assembly.

It were idle to indulge in speculation as to the amount of influence for good which the French prelates might have exercised, had they shown more zeal in repairing to the seat of the Council, strong in numerical force, and unanimous as to the objects which they desired to gain. It is well to mention, however, that in all probability they might at least have succeeded in carrying a decree for the restoration of the Eucharistic Cup to the laity. In the course of the discussions on that subject it was abundantly proved that such a change of discipline would be acceptable to large numbers of Catholics, besides being urgently demanded on behalf of the Protestants; and there is reason to believe that the Pope himself was not personally opposed to it.* But, in the absence of those who might have turned the scale decisively in favour of concession, the Council pronounced that communion "sub utraque" is not of Divine obligation;† and left it to the Pope to judge of the particular cases and circumstances in which it might be expedient to authorize it.‡ The French ambassadors, however, entered a special plea for the preservation of one of the ancient privileges of the kings of France, who were accustomed, from time immemorial, to communicate in both kinds on the day of their coronation.

The French prelates, headed by the Cardinal of Lorraine, at length reached Trent on the 13th of November, 1562. They were fifteen in number, and were accompanied by three abbots and eighteen divines of the Sorbonne. Other prelates arrived from France soon afterwards; and with these reinforcements there were two hundred and eighteen bishops assembled in Council. The Gallicans, however, were still a mere fraction as compared with the Italians, the greater part of whom were pensioners of the Pope, and, as such, his submissive creatures.

The movements of the Cardinal of Lorraine were jealously watched by the Court of Rome, since he was reported to

* Fra Paolo, Liv. vi. § 58.

† Sess. xxi. cap. i. Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 846.

‡ Concil. Trident. Sess. xxii. Fra Paolo, Liv. vi. § 56. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clx. 53.

entertain ideas and projects inimical to the Papal interests. He had been heard to boast that he would place himself at the head, not only of the French, but also of the Spanish and German prelates in the Council.* It was apprehended that, if he should thus assume the position of a party leader, he might be tempted to foment the discussion of unpalatable questions. He might think proper to ventilate the doctrine which was known to be so popular among his countrymen as to the supreme authority of General Councils; he might insist on sweeping measures of administrative reform, and the extirpation of lucrative abuses; he might agitate vexatiously for changes in the disciplinary system of the Church, for the sake of humouring the Calvinists. Every effort was, in consequence, made at Rome to counteract his influence. The Cardinal-legate of Ferrara was secretly instructed to dissuade him from attending the Council; while the legates at Trent were ordered to hasten matters so as to bring it to a close, if possible, before the dreaded visitor could make his appearance on the scene. As soon as his arrival was announced, the Pope sent a confidential emissary to Trent, ostensibly to compliment him by a mark of special favour, but in reality to act as a spy on his proceedings.†

It turned out, however, that there was no reason for such excessive mistrust. The Cardinal, undoubtedly, was a stanch Gallican on the point of the superiority of a General Council over the Pope.‡ He was charged, moreover, by his government, to urge upon the fathers of Trent certain indispensable articles of reformation, in the necessity of which he himself concurred. In principle, therefore, and as the leading representative of the Church of France, he could not do otherwise than uphold the national maxims; but it will appear in the

* See the "Memoire secret" of Prosper de Ste. Croix (Santa Croce), Nuncio at Paris, addressed to Cardinal Borromeo, Aug. 5, 1562. (*Archives Curieuses de l'Histoire de France*, tom. vi. p. 109.)

† Fra Paolo, Liv. vii. § 31. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxi. 19, 20.

‡ See his letter to his agent at Rome, Jan. 14, 1563, in *Le Plats Collection*, tom. v. p. 653. "Je ne puis nier que je suis François, nourri en l'Université de Paris, en laquelle on

tient l'autorité du Concile pardessus le Pape, et sont censurés comme hérétiques ceux qui tiennent le contraire. En France on tient le Concile de Constance pour général en toutes ses parties; l'on suit celui de Basle, et tient celui de Florence pour non légitime ni général; et l'on fera plutôt mourir les François que d'aller au contraire. . . . Les privilèges du royaume sont tous fondés et appuyés sur cette vérité."

sequel that, under the pressure of circumstances, he was practically a timeserver, and governed by the dictates of his own ambition. He forbore, when once convinced of the expediency of that course, to demand the dogmatic assertion of truths which might be detrimental to the Pope's prerogative; and on several critical occasions he lent effective aid, both by his vote and influence, to the Ultramontane section of the Council.

At the moment of his arrival the assembly was in a state of violent excitement on a question which could not well be avoided, though its discussion was by no means likely to turn to the advantage of the Church—namely the institution and jurisdiction of the episcopate. That the Christian hierarchy is of Divine origin was, of course, indisputable among Catholics; nevertheless the subject was not without its controversial difficulties. One party (the Ultramontane) held that the powers of diocesan bishops are derived mediately from the Sovereign Pontiff, who assigns to each a portion of that universal pastoral responsibility which is centralized in his person.* Others maintained, on the contrary, that all bishops are by their office equal; that their authority is immediately “of Divine right;” and that their character is complete without any form of institution by the Pope. This latter doctrine—based on the strongest evidence of primitive antiquity—was manfully enunciated, in the Congregation of the 1st of December, by Avos-mediano Bishop of Cadiz; and the plain-spoken freedom of this prelate led to a scene of unprecedented agitation in the Council. The Ultramontanes shouted “Anathema! heresy! away with him!” and it was with no small difficulty that the legates restored order. The Cardinal of Lorraine then rose, and animadverted with severity on this indecent outburst. He declared that the opinion of the Spanish prelate was anything but heretical; and added that, if it had been one of the French bishops who had met with such insolent treatment, he (the Cardinal) would have felt it his duty to protest against the acts of the Council, and to return forthwith to France.†

* “Assumptos à Romano Pontifica in partem sollicitudinis.” The phrase is taken from a well-known passage in one of St. Leo's Epistles. “Vices nostras ita tuæ credidimus Caritati, ut in partem sis vocatus sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis.” S. Leon.

Ep. xiv. (al. xii.) ad Anastas. Thessalon. Cf. Grat. Decret. Caus. iii. Q. 6, c. 8. The crux of the dispute was whether bishops derive from the Pope the power of *Order*, or only that of *jurisdiction*.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxi. 43, 44.

Addressing himself to the main question, he proceeded to discourse for two hours in a style which, though it excited universal admiration, savoured strongly of a politic compromise between conviction and expediency. Rejecting alike the extravagant Ultramontanist theory propounded by the Jesuit Lainez, and the view which attributes to the Pope no more than a precedency of rank among his equals in office, the astute Frenchman steered a middle course, which conducted him to a safe, if not a strictly logical, conclusion. He acknowledged that the Episcopal Commission proceeds immediately from Christ; but argued that its practical exercise must depend on the direction of the prince of bishops, the successor of Peter. Those were no times, he observed, for venturing upon any step which might tend to abridge the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. That authority was a principle absolutely necessary to the preservation of the unity of the Church; and for his part, nothing should ever induce him to consent to any decision which might appear to derogate from it. He, therefore, exhorted the fathers to omit the phrase “*de jure divino*” from the canon under discussion (the 7th canon on the Sacrament of Order), and to content themselves with stating in general terms that the Episcopate was instituted in the Church by Jesus Christ himself.*

The rest of the French prelates, however, were not deterred by the influence of their superior from delivering their sentiments conscientiously and freely. Some few felt it necessary to endorse the views of the great Cardinal; but the majority declared that the powers of the episcopate are inherently Divine, and independent of the Sovereign Pontiff. The superiority of the Pope over bishops, they maintained, is not a superiority of Order, but of rank or degree. The Pope, equally with all other prelates, is subject to the legislative control of the Church; he is equally bound by the canons. Those who most distinguished themselves by thus defending the ancient doctrine of the Church of France were Claude d'Angennes, Bishop of Le Mans, Eustache du Bellai, Bishop of Paris, and François de Beaucaire, Bishop of Metz,† who in former days had been tutor to the Cardinal of Lorraine.

* Paleotti *Acta Concil. Trident.* p. 348 (Edit. Mendham, 1842). Fra Paolo, Liv. vii. § 38. Pallavicino, Liv. xix. chap. 4.

† Beaucaire (or Belcarius) was author of the *Rerum Gallicarum Commentaria*, a work of considerable value for the history of these times.

The war of opinion on this much-vexed question—a question which involved, in its manifold ramifications, all the principles at issue between the constitutional and the absolutist parties in the Church—raged fiercely in the Council for many months, and at one time threatened to terminate in its dissolution.* The Cardinal of Lorraine preserved throughout the position of a mediator. Theologically, he agreed with his Gallican brethren; but he deprecated any conciliar definition of tenets known to be offensive to the Holy See; and lamented, moreover, that theoretical disputes of this kind should be allowed to obstruct the all-important work of internal reform to which the assembly was pledged. Three times did the Cardinal, at the invitation of the legates, remodel the controverted canon; they were still dissatisfied, and at length determined to refer the difficulty to the Pope. This led to further negotiations and further embarrassment. His Holiness proposed various amendments in the draft submitted to him, and subjoined to it an additional canon, in which the Pope was declared to have the power of “feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church.”†

It seems probable that, had a direct vote been taken, the Ultramontanes would have been in a majority. But the legates, knowing the strength of the opposition, wisely resolved to avoid the unseemly spectacle of a division upon a matter of such grave import; and in the end it was arranged that all mention of Pontifical supremacy should be omitted from the canon, and that the hierarchy of the Church, in its threefold order of bishops, priests, and deacons, should be defined to have its origin “ex ordinatione Divinâ.”‡ That the Court of Rome on the one hand, and the bishops of France on the other, were brought to acquiesce in this mode of winding up the dispute, was due chiefly to the judicious counsels, earnest entreaties, and masterly tactics, of the Cardinal of Lorraine.

The result was in reality a triumph for the Gallican tradition, which, in the absence of any authoritative decision of the Church to the contrary, remains a permissible and legitimate opinion,

* Fra Paolo, Liv. vii. § 53. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clx. 93.

† “Plenam potestatem pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam à Dn°. N°. Jesu Christo in B°. Petro eisdem traditam.” Cf. Pale-

otti *Act. Concil. Trident.*, p. 367. This phrase is a quotation from the famous decree of the Council of Florence.

‡ *Concil. Trident.* Sess. xxiii. cap. 4, Canon vi.

however strongly the tide of feeling among Catholics of a certain school may have run counter to it in more recent times.* So far as the Council of Trent is concerned, it is open to the faithful to regard the Episcopate as holding its functions immediately from God, without any secondary agency on the part of the Roman Pontiff; though there is nothing in the decree to make the Ultramontane theory untenable.

The Cardinal took a similar course upon the thorny question of clerical residence, which was also debated with much warmth and at tedious length. He maintained, in theory, that residence is a matter of Divine obligation; but he subjoined so many exceptions and modifications, that it was not easy to discover whether his real opinion was favourable or the reverse to the proposed decree on the subject. In this, as in other instances, the controversy turned, not so much on the doctrine, as on the *consequences* of the doctrine. If it were defined that residence is necessary by Divine command, it followed that the Pope had no authority to dispense with it; and one entire and most important branch of the Pontifical prerogative would thus be swept away. This sufficiently accounts for the earnestness with which the decree was advocated by the sincere friends of reformation, and for the pertinacity of the Ultramontanes in opposing it. The Cardinal of Lorraine desired to stand well with both parties;—to satisfy the demands of his temporal sovereign, but at the same time to avoid giving offence in the quarter from which he derived his ecclesiastical rank; and the natural result was, that his conduct was not heartily approved by either. The French bishops pronounced almost unanimously for the definition of residence as obligatory by the law of God.† Eventually the difficulty was surmounted, like many others, by a compromise. Residence was strictly enjoined upon the clergy of all ranks, including cardinals—but without any express mention of the *jus divinum*; and the Pope was declared to be the proper judge of the causes

* Cf. Bossuet, *Defens. Declarat.*, Præv. Dissert., § xiv.

† The speech of one of them—Nicolas Psaume of Verdun—drew from an Italian prelate the feeble witticism, “*Gallus nimium cantat.*” “*O utinam,*” retorted the learned Danès,

Bishop of Lavaur, “*O utinam ad hujus galli cantum Petrus resipisceret et fletet amarè!*” This anecdote is given by Gènebrard in his funeral oration for the Bishop of Lavaur in April, 1577. See *Le Plat*, tom. vii. p. 224. Paleotto, p. 573.

which, under particular circumstances, might lawfully dispense with it.*

On the 2nd of January, 1563, the French envoys transmitted to the legates their "Articles of Reformation"—thirty-four in number—with a request that they might be immediately laid before the Council. In addition to the demands already specified, they contained others bearing on the residence of the clergy, the qualifications of candidates for orders, the efficient exercise of the jurisdiction of bishops, the regular celebration of provincial Councils;—in short, the series of measures recommended would have ensured a complete revival of Church discipline throughout France.† But when the legates inquired of the Cardinal of Lorraine whether he himself approved of all these articles, he replied that there were some of them to which he strongly objected, and that he had reason to believe that this feeling was shared by many of his colleagues.‡ Indeed, it was no secret that the prelates of France were at heart opposed to a reform which would have fallen chiefly upon abuses and corruptions notoriously practised by themselves.§

The Pope, to whom the French requisitions were forthwith despatched by a special messenger, was at first much irritated, but was soon reassured by a private communication from the Cardinal of Lorraine, who intimated that his Government would be satisfied with much less in the way of concession than the whole of what was formally demanded; and that if his Holiness should think fit to grant the communion of the Cup to the laity, the marriage of priests, and the use of the vulgar tongue in Divine service, he would find no difficulty in bringing the Council to a close with honour to himself and contentment to all parties.¶ Upon this a temporising reply was forwarded from Rome to France. The Pope expressed his approbation of many of the articles, but pointed out that others were opposed to the authority and interest of the Crown itself, inasmuch as they

* Concil. Trident., Sess. xxiii. cap. 1, "De Reformatione."

† Paleotti, *Act. Concil. Trident.*, p. 400. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxiii. 4, 5.

‡ Nevertheless it appears that the Cardinal had expressly approved these articles when they were discussed and

arranged in the Council of State at Paris.

§ See the *Mémoire Secret* of the Nuncio Santa Croce to Cardinal Borromeo, under date of March 29, 1563. (*Archives Curieuses de l'Histoire de France*, tom. vi.)

¶ *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxiii. 30.

would curtail the royal prerogative of patronage, and tend to make the bishops too powerful and independent. Commending these objections to the king's consideration, he requested him to transmit fresh instructions to his ambassadors at Trent. Time was thus gained, and unwelcome demands eluded; but when the French renewed their importunities, Pius flatly refused to permit the legates to propose their articles to the Council. He seems to have done this, not so much because he disapproved of the articles themselves, as from uneasiness as to the possible consequences of yielding to external pressure at such a momentous crisis in the fortunes of the Church. Even subordinate concessions, he argued, if made in the face of danger, and for the avowed purpose of satisfying heretics, would be fatal to the principle of Pontifical authority. When these first steps had been gained, new and more serious aggressions would inevitably follow in their train; and, while difficulties increased, the means of resistance would diminish in proportion. Moreover, there was not the smallest probability that the Italian members of the Council would ever consent to innovations of this kind in the existing system of administration. The Pope, therefore, now made it his chief object to terminate the Council with as little delay as possible; and the Cardinal of Lorraine, who had lately adopted views of the same kind from motives of personal interest, afforded important assistance to his Holiness in effecting this result.

The course of events in France, since the outbreak of the civil war, had been such as to encourage the Government to hope that the Huguenots would be subdued with little difficulty, and that, ere long, the royal authority might be completely re-established. The battle of Dreux, fought on the 9th of December, 1562, was favourable to the Catholic cause. Catherine was thus enabled to negotiate on advantageous terms with the Protestant leaders, and the "pacification of Amboise" was concluded in March, 1563. It had a curious influence on the history of the Council of Trent. No sooner had the aspect of affairs brightened at home, than Catherine and her ministers began to look with much less interest on the proceedings of that distant assembly, from which they no longer expected any efficient support. They now attached less importance to the propositions of reform which at first had been so vigorously

insisted on; and, finding that the fathers were not likely to accept a line of policy dictated by the necessities of France, they instructed the Cardinal of Lorraine to turn his attention henceforth to the means of satisfying the Pope, and to co-operate with the legates in expediting the business of the Council, so that it might be dismissed without delay.

The Cardinal's private feelings ran in the same direction. He had lately sustained a cruel loss in the death of his elder brother, the duke, who was assassinated by a fanatical Huguenot at the siege of Orleans. This was a heavy blow to the ascendancy of his family in France. He saw that, if it was still to be maintained, the best way to promote it was to draw as closely as possible the bonds of sympathy between himself, the Pope, the King of Spain, and other powers, who were the bulwarks of Catholicism. Under such circumstances a cordial understanding was speedily arrived at between Pius IV. and his Eminence of Lorraine. The latter proceeded to Rome on the invitation of the holy Father, and was received with unprecedented honour; he was lodged in the Vatican, and the Pope went publicly to visit him. In the confidential interviews which followed, Pius ascertained that the prelate, whom he had once imagined to be a dangerous opponent, might be easily converted into a firm and zealous ally. A treaty to that effect was soon negotiated; and although it is not likely that its details can have been so fully divulged as Father Paul would lead us to believe, there is no doubt that they were sufficiently gratifying to the ambition and self-love of the Cardinal. The Pope hastened to announce to the legates at Trent that his guest had gained his entire confidence. Henceforward they were to treat him as a colleague in authority, and to do nothing without his knowledge and approval.*

To return to the Council. The legates, with whom lay the sole prerogative of initiating measures for consideration, at length brought forward a scheme of reform, embracing thirty-eight articles. Its most remarkable chapter related to what was called "the reformation of secular princes;"—a topic of extreme delicacy, which had been frequently alluded to as

* Pallavicino, Liv. xxi. chap. 2. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxvi. 58.

requiring discussion, and which was proposed at this moment by way of attempting to counterbalance and neutralize the claims advanced by the representatives of France. This famous chapter consisted of various provisions for correcting and restraining the jurisdiction of the Crown in respect of the Church and its ministers. The preamble stated that the holy Synod had thought fit to renew certain ancient enactments in favour of ecclesiastical immunity, hoping that lay sovereigns would regard them with respect, and cause them to be punctually observed, considering the submission which they themselves owed to the Pope and to the Church. The chief stipulations were as follows:—That ecclesiastics should not be amenable to secular tribunals for any cause, or under any pretext whatsoever. That the Crown should cease to interfere with the due exercise of the jurisdiction of the Church in matters spiritual; whether in causes of matrimony, heresy, and patronage, or in the temporal government of churches, and the administration of Church property. That the practice of “*appels comme d’abus*” should be abolished; and that any one resorting to the civil courts in the cases specified should be excommunicated, and incur the forfeiture of their rights. That the temporal judge should not be authorized to inhibit the spiritual judge from passing sentence of excommunication without his permission, nor to order him to revoke or suspend any such sentence already pronounced. That no prince or lay magistrate should make promise of the presentation to any benefice within their territories, nor procure any such preferment either from bishops or conventual chapters; any such presentation to be ipso facto null and void. That they should not lay hands on the revenues of vacant benefices, either in virtue of patronage or under pretext of appointing stewards or substitutes with a view to prevent disputes. That ecclesiastics should not be subject to the payment of taxes, or other subsidies under the name of gifts or loans, except in countries where, by ancient usage, the clergy sit in the provincial legislature for the purpose of taxing the laity equally with their own order in case of war, or other urgent necessity. And lastly, that all ecclesiastical sentences, citations, and decrees, particularly those emanating from the Court of Rome, should be at once published and executed,

without the formality of seeking consent or licence from the civil power.*

These were extravagant pretensions; and it is probable that their supporters were not serious, or at all events not hopeful of success, in attempting to force them on the acceptance of the Council. The object of the move was to create a diversion; and to intimate to those whom it might concern, that reformation is a question which has two sides—the reformation of the *clergy*, however confessedly important, being only one of them. The proceeding was keenly resented by the Court of France; the young king denounced it to his ambassadors as an attempt to “pare the nails of sovereigns, while it lengthened those of the priests.” He ordered them to protest against it with the utmost vigour, and to retire from the Council if it were not withdrawn. Upon this, Du Ferrier put forth all his energies in a spirited effort of remonstrance.† He recounted the exertions made by the kings of France for ages past to obtain a real reform of the Church and its ministers, and showed how that work had hitherto been systematically eluded. His master was amazed, he said, that the fathers should suggest measures which manifestly tended to subvert the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church,‡ and to injure the authority of the Most Christian kings, who had made laws for the government of ecclesiastics within their own dominions, which laws had been approved by successive popes, and were in accordance with the decrees of Œcumenical Councils. No such mighty progress had as yet been made at Trent in the work of reforming the Church, that the Council should overstep its proper province, and undertake the correction of secular magistrates. He went on to criticize in detail the acts and regulations of the Council, contrasting them sarcastically with the legislation of primitive ages, the restoration of which, he contended, was the only true remedy for existing evils, persistently demanded both by Church and State in France. In fine, Du Ferrier exhorted the assembled fathers, if

* Raynald. *Annal.*, tom. xv. p. 442. Fra Paolo, Liv. viii. § 53. *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxvi. 45.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxvi. 38.

‡ This shows how completely the true idea of “Gallican liberty” had been perverted and falsified by the

arts of modern politicians. Would Hincmar and St. Bernard have thought it worth their while to contend for the liberty of the Church, if they had understood it in the sense put upon it by the ambassador of Charles IX.?

they desired to see a reform among princes, to begin by imitating in their own persons those great prelates of old, who, by their sanctity and self-devotion, had acquired such commanding influence over the temporal magnates of their day. The surest way to reproduce a line of sovereigns like Theodosius, Arcadius, Valentinian, and Gratian, would be to fill the high places of the Church with a line of bishops rivalling Ambrose and Augustine, Athanasius and Chrysostom.

This scene took place during the absence of the Cardinal of Lorraine on his visit to Rome. The Pope complained to him bitterly of the intemperate and offensive tone of the ambassador. The Cardinal did his best to excuse it, blamed the legates for introducing the subject so inopportunately, and pledged himself to repair the mischief, and restore a good understanding among all parties, as soon as he returned to Trent. From that moment, nevertheless, the feelings which prevailed between the French Government and the Council were those of settled mistrust and estrangement.

The ambassadors, after delivering their protest, quitted Trent and repaired to Venice. The French bishops were instructed to remain, and offer all possible opposition to the further progress of the measure which had given such provocation to their sovereign; but in case of any fresh invasion of the royal prerogative or the Gallican liberties, they too were to absent themselves at once, without waiting for explanation or entering into longer discussion. Many of them gladly seized this opportunity to abandon the Council and return to their dioceses. Others took flight in different directions; six had accompanied the Cardinal to Rome; no more than eight continued at Trent.*

The decree relating to princes, when proposed for reconsideration; was resisted strenuously by all the ambassadors present; and the legates found it useless to urge it further. It was postponed, *pro formâ*, to a future session; but in the end it was dropped altogether.†

The Pope, on this occasion, made an indiscreet exhibition of his displeasure against the party which, as he conceived, had

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxvi. 44.

† A decree of the same character, however, with abridgments and modi-

fications, was passed by the Council in its last session. *Council. Trident.*, Sess. xxv. cap. 20.

instigated the late opposition in the Council. Some time previously (in order to mark his dissatisfaction at the terms of peace granted to the Huguenots) he had cited several French bishops suspected of favouring heresy to appear before the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome; a proceeding grossly inconsistent with the Gallican usage, which provided that bishops should be tried in the first instance before the metropolitan and his comprovincials assembled in synod.* On the 22nd of October, 1563, sentence of deposition or suspension was published against the following members of the French hierarchy, who were declared contumacious by reason of non-appearance: the Cardinal de Chatillon, Bishop of Beauvais;† St. Romain, Archbishop of Aix; Montluc, Bishop of Valence; Caraccioli, Bishop of Troyes; Barbançon, Bishop of Pamiers; Guillard, Bishop of Chartres; St. Gelais, Bishop of Uzès; and D'Albret, Bishop of Lescar. And besides inflicting these penalties on ecclesiastics, Pius was rash enough to summon the Queen of Navarre to the bar of the holy Office, there to answer the charge of heresy, under pain of being deprived of her dominions. Jeanne d'Albret was indeed notoriously a Calvinist; she had prohibited the exercise of the Catholic religion in her principality of Béarn, and had violently expelled the priests from the churches, replacing them by ministers of her own persuasion. Yet a penal process of this nature against a crowned head, so nearly connected with the royal blood of France, was not likely to be tamely tolerated. Charles IX. interfered with considerable dignity and vigour. He gave the Pope to understand that he regarded the cause of the Queen of Navarre as his own; he begged his Holiness to remember that his spiritual powers were granted for the edification of souls, and not to subserve political ends; he intreated him to revoke the measures taken against the Queen, and threatened, in case they were persisted in, to resort to the means of redress which his ancestors had employed under similar circumstances. He protested, likewise, against the infraction of the Gallican liberties in the persons of the con-

* *Mém. du Clergé de France*, tom. ii. pp. 422, 444, 456, 463.

† This prelate had openly joined the Protestants, and had married a lady of Normandy, Isabelle de Hauteville, who

assumed the title of Comtesse de Beauvais. Eventually the cardinal was deprived of his preferments, and retired to England, where he died in 1571.

demned prelates.* The Pontiff, who was not prepared for such a resolute resistance, found it necessary to give way; and, after several conferences with the French ambassador at Rome, signified that no further steps would be taken, either in the matter of the Queen of Navarre, or as to the execution of the sentence passed upon the bishops.

The Cardinal of Lorraine returned to Trent on the 9th of November; and acted thenceforward as the Pope's plenipotentiary for carrying into effect his anxious desire to close the Council. When the decrees of reformation came to be finally examined, the Cardinal said that, although he could have wished that the restoration of discipline had been more extensive and complete, he assented to the acts of the Council, in the hope that the Sovereign Pontiff in his wisdom would supply whatever might be wanting, either by reviving the ancient laws of the Church, or by summoning future General Councils.

Little of importance occurred to disturb the harmony of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions. The French ambassadors remained sullenly at Venice. The Cardinal repeatedly urged them to return, reminding them that the objectionable decrees had been greatly modified and virtually suppressed, and pointing out how injurious it might be to the character both of France and of the Council if the final transactions of such an assembly should be unsanctioned by the presence of any official delegate from the "eldest son of the Church." They replied, however, that they were acting in obedience to the King's express order;† and that, independently of the odious chapter on the "reformation of princes," the Council had made, and was about to publish, various other regulations repugnant to the rights of the French Crown and to the liberties of the Gallican Church; so that, on the whole, the interests of France might be better served by the absence of the royal commissioners, than by their presence.

All parties at Trent being now agreed as to the policy of an immediate termination of the Council, the remaining formalities were despatched with almost precipitate haste. The fathers

* Fra Paolo, Liv. viii. § 67. *Contin.*
de Fleury, Liv. clxvi. 63.

† The letter of Charles IX., ap-

proving their conduct, is given in Le Plat, tom. vi. p. 287.

dutifully petitioned the Pope to confirm their decrees; they passed a general declaration that all the acts of the Council, from its commencement under Paul III. to its close, were to be understood "without prejudice to the authority of the Apostolic See;" and they assigned to the Pope the exclusive power of interpreting the decrees, and of providing for any difficulties that might arise with regard to their reception by the States of Christendom.* The altered current of feeling in the Council, occasioned by the *conversion* of the Cardinal of Lorraine and the withdrawal of so many of the Gallican bishops, is signally apparent in these last enactments. Six months previously, the opposition to Ultramontaniam was so powerful that a proposal to assert the supremacy of the Pope as the chief pastor and ruler of the Church had been negatived as impracticable. Now, the entire legislation of the Council was surrendered to the uncontrolled arbitration of the Holy See; and an implied sanction was thereby given to the dogma which the Church of other days had so emphatically rejected, that the Roman Pontiff is superior to General Councils.

The privileges thus liberally accorded were turned to the utmost advantage at Rome. In the bull of confirmation, dated January 26, 1564, the Pope prohibited all persons ecclesiastical and civil, of whatever rank or dignity, from publishing any comments, glosses, annotations, or interpretations, concerning the acts and decrees of the Council, without his permission, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto*.† If in any case interpretation might seem necessary, it was to be sought from the Apostolic See, "the mistress of all the faithful, whose authority had been so recently acknowledged by the Holy Synod itself." "All such difficulties," said Pius, "we reserve to be by us explained and decided, being prepared to provide for the necessities of all the provinces, in such manner as we shall judge most convenient; ordaining that whatever may be attempted to the contrary with respect to these matters, by any person or authority whatsoever, is null and void." A congregation of eight cardinals was afterwards appointed for the purpose of enforcing the due observance of the Tridentine decrees.

The Council terminated its labours on the 4th of December,

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxviii. 6.

† See the bull "*Benedictus Deus*," in Labbe, *Concil.*, tom. xiv. p. 939.

1563; on which occasion the customary acclamations were pronounced by the Cardinal of Lorraine, according to a form composed by himself. Two hundred and fifty-five prelates subscribed the decrees; but of this number only seven were representatives of the Gallican Church.

No sooner had the Cardinal of Lorraine returned to France, than he was attacked in various quarters for having sanctioned, in the later sessions at Trent, decisions incompatible with the laws of the land, the dignity of the sovereign, and the liberties of the Gallican Church. He defended himself by referring to a formal protest which he had delivered in the twenty-fourth session, expressing his assent to the acts of the Council with a distinct reservation of all rights and privileges, ecclesiastical and civil, appertaining both to Church and State in France.* Besides which, as he observed with much justice, it was absurd to expect that, with no more than six of his countrymen to back him, he could withstand with effect an assembly of upwards of two hundred bishops.

The Nuncio Santa Croce now applied to the Government to promulgate an official announcement of the reception of the Council, according to the forms of the constitution. Upon this the King called a meeting of the heads of the Parliament and other great functionaries, to consider what course should be taken. There was a sharp altercation on this occasion between the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Chancellor de l'Hôpital, who still held the post of chief adviser of the Crown. The Chancellor strongly advocated the expediency of postponing for the present any public recognition of the Council; remarking that, since many points of importance,—for instance, the usage of the Cup in the Eucharist,—had been referred to the decision of the Pope, it was desirable to wait, at least, until his Holiness should make known his judgment upon these particulars. The Cardinal replied angrily. He did not know, he said, what religion the Chancellor really belonged to; but it seemed as if he had none other than that of doing all the injury he could to himself and the house of Guise—a line of conduct grossly ungrateful to those who had been his earliest friends and benefactors. De l'Hôpital replied by declaring that

* See the Cardinal's protest in *Le Plat*, tom. vi. p. 290.

he could never forget his many and deep obligations to his Eminence of Lorraine; but that he must beg to be excused from discharging them at the expense of the honour and interest of his sovereign. The Queen interposed to stop the dispute; and the Council adjourned without making any order as to the reception of the decrees of Trent.*

The demand was repeated again and again with increased earnestness; and was evaded for some time upon similar pretexts. But at length it became necessary to speak distinctly; and the Parliament of Paris announced that the Council of Trent could not be publicly received without prejudicing the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the Gallican Church. The principal points specified on the first head were the following:—1. The decree against duels;† by which princes permitting such encounters to take place in their territories were excommunicated, and, moreover, were deprived of the lordship of the town, chateau, or other spot in which the duel may have been fought. 2. The decree authorizing the Pope to appoint bishops in the room of those who might persist, after monition, in remaining absent from their dioceses;‡—an arrangement clearly contrary to the Concordat. 3. The decree empowering ecclesiastical judges to impose pecuniary fines upon laymen, and to compel payment by imprisonment, if necessary, making use of their own officers for the purpose.§ 4. That which placed all public hospitals under the visitation and control of the bishops.|| 5. That by which the bishops were authorized to compel the inhabitants of any place to provide a sufficient stipend for the parish priest, and to make all necessary repairs in parish churches.¶

The articles objected to as infringing the Gallican liberties were those by which criminal causes affecting bishops were reserved to the sole cognizance of the Pope, in contravention of the ancient discipline, which made them amenable in the first instance to the Metropolitan and the Provincial Council; also, the right assigned to the Pope of evoking to Rome ecclesiastical causes which may be pending before the ordinary

* Sainte Croix to Cardinal Borromeo, February 25, 1564. *Archives Curieuses de l'H. de F.*, tom. vi. p. 155.

† Sess. xxv. cap. 19.

|| Sess. vii. cap. 15.

‡ Sess. vi. cap. 1.

¶ Sess. xxiv. cap. 13.

§ Sess. xxv. cap. 3.

judges.* The Parliament disapproved, moreover, the regulation allowing the Pope to grant pensions and “reserves des fruits,” chargeable on benefices; and that permitting the Mendicant Orders to hold corporate property.†

The celebrated advocate Charles Dumoulin, being consulted for his opinion on the Tridentine decrees, drew up and published a statement containing a long catalogue of reasons which made it impossible, in his judgment, that the Council should be received in France. These grounds of exception relate in some few instances to doctrine; but the author chiefly animadverts upon the canons of discipline, many of which he declares to be at variance with the ancient Councils,—derogatory to the rights of the king, the authority of his edicts and those of the courts of justice,—as well as contrary to the liberties and immunities of the National Church.‡

Dumoulin was, unfortunately, a seceder from the Church; and his exposition of constitutional law was in some particulars tinged too strongly by his known religious partialities. His enemies denounced him to the Parliament, on the ground that his publication had been made without the king's permission, and that he had compromised the Government by pretending that it was put forth by order of the Council of State. Upon this he was severely interrogated by the magistrates as to the views expressed in his writings; which he could not deny to be substantially those of the Protestants. The Parliament, while strenuously Gallican, was rigid in its abhorrence of heresy; and in consequence, although Dumoulin's conclusions agreed with their own as to the inadmissibility of the decrees above specified, they committed him without scruple to the Conciergerie. He was soon released by the King's orders, no doubt through the interference of De l'Hôpital;—promising, as the conditions of his liberty, that he would publish nothing in future on political or theological questions, and that he would carefully avoid speculations on the authority of Councils and of the Apostolic See, which might occasion scandal to his Majesty's subjects.§

* Sess. xiii. cap. 8; xxiv. cap. 5; cap. 20.

† Fra Paolo, Liv. viii. § 86.

‡ See this important document in the *Mémoires de Condé*, tom. v. p. 81 et

seqq.

§ De Thou, *Hist. Univ.*, Liv. xxxvi. Charles Dumoulin shortly afterwards returned to the communion of the Church, and died a Catholic in 1566.

Special instances for the reception of the Council in France were made in the year 1565, by a joint embassy from the Pope, the King of Spain, and the Duke of Savoy. But Charles IX., under the direction of his mother and De l'Hôpital, returned an ambiguous response, from which it was gathered that, while he was anxious not to offend the great Catholic Powers, he had determined to adjourn indefinitely a measure which would have been treated by the Huguenots as almost equivalent to a declaration of war.*

The French bishops, however, obtained authority from the Government to give effect within their dioceses to those of the Tridentine canons which were not repugnant to the laws and constitutions of the realm. For this purpose the Cardinal of Lorraine convoked without delay a provincial synod at Reims, at which a series of decrees were passed in exact conformity with those of Trent, and the clergy were ordered to provide themselves with copies of the acts of the Council in French and Latin, and to regulate their teaching and conduct by that standard.† At the provincial Council of Cambrai, held in the following year, the decrees were accepted as the authoritative law of the Church, and the Confession of Faith prescribed in the Pope's bull of November, 1564 (commonly called the Creed of Pope Pius IV.), was signed by all the prelates and deputies of the clergy present. Similar measures were taken subsequently by the Metropolitans of Rouen, Tours, Bordeaux, Aix, Bourges, and Toulouse. But it must not be imagined that this ecclesiastical recognition of the Council gave to its enactments the character and force of statute law in France. The approbation of the Church (though even this was subject to certain limitations) made them canonically binding on the clergy; but they were not on that account placed on the same footing with those laws which the executive authority undertook to enforce upon all classes of French subjects. In order to be embodied with the national legal code, it was requisite that the Council should be accepted by the sovereign, sanctioned by the Council of State, and registered by the Parliament—the constitutional guardian of the laws of the kingdom.

To obtain for the Tridentine decrees this universally coercive

* De Thou, Liv. xxxvi.

† Labbe and Cossart, tom. xv. p. 43.

jurisdiction was an object which the Gallican Church pursued through many generations with indefatigable zeal; but invariably without success. The "remonstrances" of the Assemblies of the clergy, in 1567, 1577, 1579, 1582, 1585, 1588, and 1596, and on other occasions, were met with the stereotyped reply, that it was judged inexpedient, for reasons of state which had been often cited, to proceed to any official publication of the Council. Nor has any such ratification of its authority by the civil power been granted in France from that day to the present. In regard to doctrine, the definitions of Trent constitute the law of the Church, as in all other branches of the Roman obedience; many of its decrees of discipline, moreover, have been carried into execution by the Gallican prelates, as salutary in themselves, and clearly in accordance with the spirit of the ancient canons; but neither its doctrine nor its discipline has ever been incorporated by the State with the body of national law.

It is not to be denied that such a policy was inconsistent with that high profession of Catholicism upon which the French monarchy had been wont to pride itself, as one of its essential characteristics, from the earliest records of its history. For, after all, the Council of Trent was either a legitimate assembly of the Western Church by representation, or it was not. If it was not, why did France recognize and deal with it as such? Why send ambassadors to attend its sessions? Why appeal to its judgment, and seek its support under the complicated political difficulties of the time? But if it *was* a legitimate Council, upon what principle was its authority questioned and its decisions disallowed? Philip of Spain was consistent in *accepting* the Council; the Lutherans and Huguenots and Anglicans were consistent, according to their light, in *rejecting* it; but where was the consistency of the "eldest son of the Church"?

That this anomalous behaviour on the part of the French Government admits of sufficient explanation, is abundantly evident from the facts which have been placed before the reader in the course of the foregoing narrative. But we cannot be surprised to find that that explanation was anything but satisfactory to the great majority of the Gallican clergy. In their eyes, the refusal to publish the Council of Trent was scarcely less odious than the suppression of the right of free election by

the provisions of the Concordat. It seemed as if the Government were bent upon adding wantonly to their mortification. The Concordat, detested by the clergy as having deprived them of the most cherished privilege of their order, was rigidly enforced by the Crown to its very letter; while the Tridentine code, which the Church regarded as the charter of its restored liberties—the Palladium of its authority—was, for that reason and no other, jealously disavowed and discountenanced. This fresh grievance was keenly irritating to all Catholics who had not been corrupted by covetousness and the blandishments of court favour. It was a germ of strife, which proved calamitously fruitful during the subsequent convulsions of the “League.”

CHAPTER III.

THE famous association known as the "Catholic League," or "Holy Union," took its rise from the strangely indulgent terms granted to the Huguenots by the "Peace of Monsieur," in April, 1576. Four years had scarcely elapsed since the blood-stained Eve of St. Bartholomew. It had been hoped that by means of that execrable crime the Reformation would have been finally crushed and extinguished in France; but instead of this, a treaty was concluded with the heretics, which placed them in a more favourable situation than they had ever occupied before. The free exercise of their religion throughout the kingdom, with the exception of Paris and the actual residence of the sovereign; permission to hold synods, provided that an officer of the Crown was always present; the establishment of "chambres mi-parties" in the Parliaments, to take cognizance of all causes between Protestants and Catholics; the legal recognition of the marriage of priests and monks who had seceded from the Church to the Calvinist communion; and the concession of certain cautionary towns, to be held for a specific time by Huguenot officers and troops; such were the conditions imposed upon the Crown by this remarkable act of pacification.* We cannot wonder that it was regarded by the majority of Catholics as a wicked and cowardly betrayal of their most sacred interests. They ascribed it to its true source, namely, the hopeless incapacity of the reigning monarch, Henry III.; a prince whose monstrous vices and gross misgovernment were destined to reduce France to a state of disorganization bordering on national ruin.

The idea of a general confederation of Catholics for the defence of the Faith against the inroads of heresy had been suggested by the Cardinal of Lorraine during the Council of Trent, and had been favourably entertained at the Court of Rome.† The Duke

* De Thou, Liv. lxii. L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri III.*, tom. i. p. 133.

† *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxxiv. 62.

of Guise was to have been placed at the head of this alliance; but his sudden death changed the face of affairs, and the project fell into abeyance. The Cardinal of Lorraine was now no more; he died at Avignon, at the age of fifty, in December, 1574; on which occasion the Queen Mother, imagining that the event would destroy for ever the ascendancy of the house of Guise, congratulated herself and those around her, that "henceforth there would be peace in France." * She miscalculated. Henry, the third Duke of Guise, inherited in their fullest extent the ambition, the religious ardour, the lofty political aspirations, the enterprising spirit, the personal popularity, of his predecessors. The League of 1576 was conceived entirely in his interest. He was the leader naturally pointed out for such a movement;—a movement which, although its ulterior objects were at first studiously concealed, aimed in reality at substituting the family of Lorraine for that of Valois on the throne of France.

The designs of the confederates, as set forth in the original manifesto which was circulated for signature, seemed at first sight highly commendable, both with regard to religion and politics. According to this document, the Union was formed for three great purposes: to uphold the Catholic Church; to suppress heresy; and to maintain the honour, the authority, and prerogatives of the Most Christian king and his successors. On closer examination, however, expressions were detected which hinted at less constitutional projects. "Many good Catholics," says Palma-Cayet, "saw that underneath these articles there lay hid something which was likely to produce infinite trouble and division in France." † Thus, for instance, it was provided that if any of the confederates should be attacked or molested, the Union was bound to defend them, even by force of arms, *against any and all persons whatsoever*. Again, the head of the League,

* Pierre de L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri III.*, tom. i. p. 109 (Petitot's Collection). The Cardinal died of a fever brought on by exposure to the weather during a religious procession. "La maladie," says L'Estoile, "etoit au cerveau, et jusqu'à la fin il ne savoit ce qu'il disoit et faisoit; mourant en grand trouble et inquiétude d'esprit, invoquant même les diables sur ses derniers soupirs; chose épouvantable,

et toutefois temoignée de tous ceux qui lui assistirent." Catherine is said to have been disturbed more than once by spectral apparitions of the departed prelate. Mezerai, however, gives a different account of the causes and circumstances of his death.—*Hist. du Règne de Henri III.*, tom. i. p. 114, 115.

† Palma-Cayet, Introduction to the *Chronologie Novenaire* (Petitot's Collection, tom. xxxviii. p. 257.)

who was not yet named, was to exercise absolute authority over all the members; any one refusing to obey him was to be punished as he might direct. He was to be the sole judge of any dispute which might arise in the society; and no one was to resort to the ordinary course of justice without his permission. Moreover, all persons refusing to join the Union were to be treated as enemies, and encountered sword in hand.

From this significant, though mysterious, language we may gather that the Leaguers contemplated from the first the establishment of a central power independent of the sovereign, and foreign to the constitution. But their secret aims became incontestably manifest soon afterwards, when one of their confidential agents, an advocate named David, happened to die suddenly on his return from Rome, and his papers fell into the hands of the Huguenots, who immediately made them public. Their contents were of so extravagant and dangerous a nature, that at first they were considered to be forgeries; but their genuineness was established beyond question by a despatch received by Henry III. from his ambassador at Madrid, enclosing a copy of the most important of these documents, which had been forwarded to the King of Spain.* A change of dynasty in France was the avowed object of the scheme thus disclosed. It set forth, in substance, that the Capetian monarchs were usurpers,—the throne belonging rightfully to the house of Lorraine as the lineal descendants of Charlemagne. The Divine malediction had pursued the intrusive princes from generation to generation. Some had been deprived of reason; some had died in captivity; others had been visited with the heaviest censures of the Church. Their continual embroilments with the Holy See had given birth to the damnable form of error commonly called the “Liberty of the Gallican Church,” which, in point of fact, was a mere screen for heresy. The late peace, so advantageous to the Calvinists, would have the effect of establishing that sect permanently in France, unless the opportunity were seized to restore the crown to its legitimate owners. To this end the clergy must denounce, both in the pulpit and the confessional, the concessions just made to the sectaries, and excite the people to oppose their execu-

* De Thion, Liv. lxiii.

tion. Lists must be drawn up by the parish priests throughout the kingdom of all persons capable of bearing arms, and they should be prepared to take part in a general rising in defence of the Catholic religion, under the leadership of the Duke of Guise. Every effort must be made to secure, in the States-General about to be held at Blois, a preponderance of members solemnly pledged to the cause of the League. The articles of the engagement to be subscribed by them should be submitted to the Pope, and embodied, under the sanction of his Holiness, in a formal covenant to be entered into between the see of Rome and the French nation. Any prince of the blood opposing the proceedings of the States-should be declared incapable of succeeding to the throne; if in a lower rank, they should be banished from the realm, and their property confiscated. The three orders of the States-General should make a public profession of allegiance to the Pontiff and the ancient Church; they should promulgate the Council of Trent; they should absolutely revoke all edicts favourable to heresy. The king was to be requested to name the Duke of Guise Lieutenant-General of the kingdom. The League being thus put in possession of the supreme command of the royal forces, the Duke of Alençon * was to be tried for high treason as an abettor of heretics and rebels, and decisive measures were to be taken for the total suppression and abolition of the "Pretended Reformed Religion." After this the Duke of Guise, with the advice and permission of the Pope, was to imprison Henry for the rest of his days in a monastery, after the example of his ancestor Pepin when he dethroned the Merovingian Childeric. Lastly, the heir of the Carlovingians was to be proclaimed King of France; and, on assuming the crown, was to make such arrangements with his Holiness as would secure the complete recognition of the sovereignty of the Vicar of Christ, by abrogating for ever the so-called "liberties of the Gallican Church." †

Such were the particulars of this revolutionary plot;—a plot which, unhappily, was viewed with cordial sympathy, and supported with enthusiastic zeal, by many of the prelates, and a large majority of the parochial clergy, of France. It was a line of conduct widely at variance with the principles and traditions

* "Monsieur," the King's brother.

† *Mémoires de la Ligue*, tom. i. p. 5-7. Anquetil, *Esprit de la Ligue*, tom. ii. p. 177.

of their order; but if revolt from a lawful sovereign is ever justifiable by the pressure of exceptional circumstances, some excuse may be found for it in the state of the French court and government during the disgraceful reign of Henry III.

Not only had the king made himself personally odious by his life of shameless profligacy, but the Church had been subjected of late years to a series of provocations which had seriously shaken its ancient loyalty. The right of patronage acquired by the Concordat was more and more scandalously abused. Every rule of discipline was outraged by the practice of bestowing bishoprics and abbeys upon laymen and others notoriously disqualified; so that it had become the exception, rather than the rule, for a bishop to reside in his diocese and discharge his pastoral duties. Again, the taxes levied on the clergy had increased to an intolerable extent. Besides defraying, on behalf of the Government, the whole of the annuities called "*rentes de l'Hôtel de Ville*," they had been mulcted to the amount of sixty millions of livres (upwards of 600,000*l.*) between 1560 and 1576, in extraordinary subsidies. Added to this, the Church had been deeply wronged by repeated alienation of its landed property. Charles IX. extorted from the clergy in this manner an annual revenue of 50,000 crowns in 1563. A similar act of confiscation, sanctioned by a bull of Pius V., took place in 1568, a proviso being added on this occasion by his Holiness, that the money should be employed in prosecuting the war against the heretics. A third alienation, to the amount of 50,000 crowns of income, was submitted to in 1576. It was the soreness arising from these and other aggressions of the temporal power which led to the importunate demands of the French synods for the promulgation of the Council of Trent; and the pertinacious refusal of that boon by the Government became a further grievance which was bitterly resented. The lenient treatment of the heretics contrasted vexatiously with the harshness and rapacity thus shown to the dominant communion. By the treaty of 1576 the Protestants were placed, in respect both of civil and religious rights, almost, if not altogether, on an equal footing with Catholics; a stretch of liberality unprecedented in France, and deemed by many to be a grave infraction of the fundamental laws of the realm. The exclusive profession and maintenance of the Catholic reli-

gion, it was contended, was not only a "law of the king,"—not a mere ordonnance of any individual sovereign—but "a law of the *kingdom*;" an enactment, that is, of the three Estates of the national legislature, and one which could not be repealed but by the same authority. The king was not entitled to claim allegiance from his subjects until he had bound himself, by his coronation oath, to observe this statute; it was upon this absolute indefeasible condition that he held his crown.* The position now yielded to the Separatists, therefore, was a breach of the original compact made between the French crown and the French people, when Clovis was baptized and solemnly anointed by S. Remi. The reigning monarch, it was evident, could not fulfil the essential purposes for which his office existed; he could not efficiently protect the one Apostolic faith of the one Apostolic Church. Under such circumstances what was the duty of good subjects? Ought they not to take counsel and band together to uphold those great constitutional principles which a vacillating and pusillanimous prince seemed ready to abandon? What confidence could Catholics repose in one whose policy consisted in friendly negotiations with the arch-heretic Henry of Navarre, and in loading the Huguenots with privileges and guarantees which made them almost independent of the central government? Was it not imperative to provide a remedy for such ruinous incapacity? The moment had arrived when all true-hearted patriots must combine in defence of the institutions of their country and the religion of their ancestors. Those who held aloof would vainly reproach themselves hereafter, if they should live to see the day when throne and altar,

* This principle was distinctly enunciated in the manifesto of the Cardinal of Bourbon, March, 31, 1585. "Ce royaume tres-Chrétien ne souffrira jamais regner un hérétique, attendu que les sujets ne sont tenus de reconnoître ni soutenir la domination d'un prince dévoyé de la foi Catholique et relaps, étant le premier serment que fassent nos rois, lorsque l'on leur met la couronne sur la tête, maintenir la religion Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine, sous lequel serment ils reçoivent celui de fidélité de leurs sujets, et non autrement." *Mem. de la Ligue*, tom. i. p. 56. The same view of the contract between Catholic sove-

reigns and their subjects is taken by Fénelon (*De Summi Pontificis auctoritate*, cap. xxxix.). "Catholicarum gentium hæc fuit sententia animis altè impressa, scilicet supremam auctoritatem committi non posse nisi Principi Catholico, eamque esse legem sive conditionem tanto contractui appositam populos inter et principem ut populi principi fideles parerent, modo princeps ipse Catholicæ religioni obsequeretur. Quâ lege positâ, passim putabant omnes solummodo esse vinculum sacramenti fidelitatis à totâ gente præstitum, simul atque princeps, eâ lege violatâ, Catholicæ religioni contumaci animo resisteret."

public law and private freedom, political credit and national unity, had been demolished in one indiscriminate overthrow.

Thus argued the zealots of the League; and the most energetic and influential among them, as I have said, were priests and prelates of the Gallican Church. Some idea may be formed of the prevalence of clerical disaffection from the fact that, of all the parochial benefices in the capital, there were only three that were not held by declared adherents of the faction.* Each parish, carefully organized by its pastor, became a focus of seditious agitation. Three out of the four personages styled "the pillars of the League" were ecclesiastics;—Jean Prévost, doctor of the Sorbonne and curé of S. Séverin, Jean Boucher, also a member of the Sorbonne and curé of S. Benoît, and Matthieu de Launay, a canon of Soissons. The fourth, the Sieur de Rochelonde, was a layman, but closely connected with the Church, being "réceveur des décimes" for the diocese of Paris. They were soon joined by others, among whom were two in high station, Aymar Hennequin, Bishop of Rennes, and Guillaume Rose, Bishop of Senlis; and the secret committee thus formed afterwards developed into the Council of the "Seize," which for many years held absolute sway in the metropolis.† The clerical leaguers distinguished themselves so much as preachers, that in a short time they monopolised all the important pulpits in Paris. Year after year they were appointed to deliver the Lenten course of sermons at the cathedral of Notre-Dame; which was esteemed an office of high honour, and gave unbounded facilities for exciting the fanatical passions of the multitude.

The death of the Duke of Anjou, presumptive heir to the throne, in 1584, determined the League to immediate action. In the event of the king's dying without issue, which was most probable,—the crown would now devolve upon Henry of Bourbon, the acknowledged leader of the Huguenots;—a contingency which, in the view of the ultra-Catholics (and, as we have seen, they were not without plausible grounds for maintaining it) would subvert the entire framework of the constitution. They were compelled, therefore, by the necessities of their position, to abandon the principles of Divine right and hereditary succession,

* Ch. Labitte, *La démocratie chez les Prédicateurs de la Ligue*, p. 76. The three exceptions were St. Eustache, St.

Sulpice, and St. Méry.

† Palma-Cayet, *Introduction to the Chronologie Novenaire*, p. 273.

and to look round for a candidate who, in default of legitimate claim by birth, possessed qualifications for the throne which they accounted even more important. Not venturing to put forth openly the pretensions of the Duke of Guise, they fixed upon the Cardinal of Bourbon, Archbishop of Rouen, uncle of the King of Navarre; an insignificant person, far advanced in years, whose name was evidently borrowed for mere purposes of temporary convenience. A flattering proposal was made to the cardinal, and entertained by him, that he should procure a dispensation from his vows, and afterwards marry the Duchess of Montpensier, sister of the Duke of Guise.

In January, 1585, the chiefs of the League signed a secret treaty at Joinville with the King of Spain, by which the contracting parties made common cause for the extirpation of all sects and heresies in France and the Netherlands, and for excluding from the French throne princes who were heretics, or who "treated heretics with public impunity." It was stipulated that the decrees of the Council of Trent should be received and enforced in France in their full extent. Liberal supplies of men and money were to be furnished to the insurgents by Philip from the moment that war should break out; the subsidies to be repayable on the accession of the Cardinal de Bourbon, "or of his successor." *

The Leaguers lost no time in seeking for their enterprise the all-important sanction of the Holy See. For this purpose they despatched as their envoy to Rome a Jesuit named Claude Matthieu, whose indefatigable activity in their service made him famous afterwards under the title of the "courier of the League." The Jesuit fraternity in France had embraced with passionate ardour the anti-royalist cause. The sole exception was the celebrated Edmond Auger, at this time confessor to Henry III.; who, being sincerely attached to his royal penitent, refused to listen to any treasonable overtures, and exerted himself to confirm the wavering fidelity of others. The General of the order, Aquaviva, testified his disapproval of this conduct by summarily removing Auger from his confidential post at court.†

Matthieu, in concert with Cardinal de Pellevè, Archbishop of

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxxvii. 2.

† Cretineau-Joly, *Hist. de la Comp. de Jésus*, tom. ii. p. 400.

Sens, who was then residing at Rome, did his utmost to obtain from Pope Gregory XIII. an authoritative approval of the League and its proceedings. His Holiness, however, was cautious and reserved. He expressed in general terms his consent to the project of taking up arms against the heretics, and granted a plenary indulgence to those who should aid in that holy work. But he declined to countenance the deposition of the king by violence,* and answered vaguely when pressed to launch a formal sentence of excommunication against Henry of Navarre. Nor did Gregory's successor, Sixtus V., show himself at all better disposed to endorse the revolutionary views of the League. He met the solicitations of the Duke of Nevers by inquiring "in what school he had learned that it was lawful to form political associations contrary to the will of his sovereign?" He sympathized with Henry in his perplexities, and predicted that, ere long, he would be compelled to resort for help to the heretics in order to emancipate himself from the tyranny of the Catholics. At length, however, Sixtus was persuaded to fulminate a bull against the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé, in which, after expatiating in unmeasured language on the supreme power of the Apostolic See over all earthly potentates,—who, when they failed in their duty, "were to be chastised and crushed as ministers of Satan,"—he declared the two princes to be heretics relapsed, and notorious fautors and abettors of heresy; as such, they had incurred all the pains and penalties denounced by the Church on these offences; and, in consequence, the said Henry of Bourbon was deprived of his pretended kingdom of Navarre, and of the principality of Béarn, and Henry of Condé in like manner was stripped of whatever dignities, domains, fiefs, and lordships, he might possess. Both culprits, together with their heirs and posterity, were pronounced for ever incapable of succeeding to the throne of France, or any other dignity; their subjects and vassals were released from their oath of homage, and forbidden to obey them under pain of excommunication. Lastly, the King of France

* "Le Pape ne trouve pas bon que l'on attente sur la vie du Roi, car cela ne se peut faire en bonne conscience; mais si en pouvoit se saisir de sa personne, et lui donner gens qui le

tinissent en bride, et lui donnassent bon conseil et le lui fissent exécuter, on trouveroit bon cela."—*Mémoires de Nevers*. Anquetil, *L'esprit de la Ligue*.

was exhorted to cause the sentence to be executed, and the prelates of the realm were enjoined, on their canonical obedience, to publish it in their respective dioceses.*

Such was the state of imbecility and helplessness to which Henry of Valois was reduced, that he durst not deal with this outrageous document as it deserved. The Parliament of Paris remonstrated against it with manly vigour, representing to the king that he ought to treat it as one of his royal ancestors had done with a bull of similar import—namely, to consign it to the flames in the presence of the Gallican Church, and to take such exemplary vengeance upon those who had expedited it from Rome as should serve for a lesson to all posterity.† They firmly refused to register the bull, and the king, too feeble to enforce obedience, contented himself with allowing the matter to drop in silence. Henry of Navarre, however, published an indignant reply to the Pope's sentence, appealing against it, "comme d'abus," to the French court of peers; he retorted the charge of heresy upon Sixtus himself, and offered to prove it before a free and legitimate Council; and he concluded by threatening measures of retaliation, such as had been taken by several princes of his family in former days against similar acts of insolent aggression by the Court of Rome.‡ The Pope openly expressed his admiration of this exhibition of spirit and energy on the part of the Huguenot chief.

The excommunication of the King of Navarre was an important boon to the Leaguers; they now increased rapidly in general credit and popularity as the champions of the orthodox faith. Their preachers began to declaim vehemently, not only against the heretics, but against Henry III., whom they persisted in representing as a partisan and accomplice of these enemies of the Church. The irregularities of the king's life, combined with his occasional paroxysms of superstitious devotion, furnished abundant food for their philippics. The grotesque processions of the "confréries de pénitents" were ridiculed without mercy by Maurice Poncet, curé of S. Pierre des Arcis, a

* *Mémoires de la Ligue*, tom. i. p. 343.

† P. de L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri III.*, tom. i. p. 299. (Petitot, I série, tom. xlv.)

‡ This protest was drawn up by

Pierre de l'Estoile, the author of the *Journal de Henri III.* L'Estoile was a member of the Grand Conseil, and an "audiençier" of the Chancery of France.

divine of great eloquence and considerable learning, though not remarkable for refinement of taste or diction. Poncet made the walls of his church ring with denunciations of these hypocritical devotees, who, after parading the streets barefoot, arrayed in sackcloth, and displaying ostentatiously the outward signs of austere asceticism, were accustomed to pass the night in riotous feasting and gross debauchery. Henry, resenting this exposure, banished the offender to his abbey of Saint Père at Melun; but he was released after a brief confinement, and returned to Paris by the king's permission, his Majesty remarking that "he had always believed the good doctor to have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; and that there was much excuse for him, since he was not quick enough of apprehension to see through the artifices of those by whom he was instigated. He had plenty of scholarship, but was grievously deficient in judgment."* Poncet, unsubdued by the king's leniency, resumed his usual incisive style of pulpit oratory, and persevered in it till his death, which happened in 1586.

Guillaume Rose, one of the king's preachers in ordinary, made himself equally conspicuous by satirizing the eccentricities of his sovereign. Henry rebuked him for his insolence, and Rose sued for forgiveness; whereupon the king sent him a few days afterwards four hundred crowns, "to help him to buy sugar and honey to sweeten his bitter words, that he might pass Lent more comfortably."† Rose was already grand-master of the college of Navarre, and in 1584 the king preferred him to the bishopric of Senlis; but, notwithstanding these marks of favour, he continued to vituperate his benefactor, and foment sedition with the utmost violence and malignity. Such was his extravagance, that it was ascribed to a sort of frenzy or delirium, to which he was said to be periodically subject.

Every day the League became more desperate in its attacks on the tottering throne of the last of the Valois. The Duchess of Montpensier, who regarded Henry with profound and deadly hatred, maintained a troop of preachers regularly in her pay, whose sole business was to inflame the minds of the populace against him, and prepare them for his forcible deposition. She was wont to say that she had done more for the good cause by

* P. de L'Estoile, tom. i. p. 264.

† Ibid., p. 252.

means of her preachers, than her brothers had done by their treaties and their armies.* They were actively seconded by the Jesuits, the mendicant friars, the Sorbonne, the Pope's nuncio, and the secret emissaries of Philip of Spain. The Sorbonne, at a meeting on the 16th of December, 1587, passed a resolution that "it was lawful to take away the government from an ill-conducted and incompetent prince, just as a guardian who proved himself unworthy of confidence might be deprived of his office." For this piece of effrontery the doctors received a severe castigation from the king himself, who summoned them to his presence at the Louvre, and upbraided them before the whole court for assailing him with personal calumnies, and impugning his administration of the affairs of state. He was not disposed, he said, to visit their offence very seriously, considering that their resolution had been passed after dinner. He would have them know, however, that an outrage of the same kind had been promptly punished by Pope Sixtus, who had lately sent to the galleys certain Franciscan preachers who had dared to slander him in their discourses. They (the doctors) deserved a like treatment, or, perhaps, something worse; nevertheless, he was willing to forgive and forget the past, on condition that such conduct was not repeated. In case of any fresh indiscretion, he should order his court of Parliament to bring them to condign justice forthwith.†

But Henry's circumstances were such that neither his acts of clemency nor his threats of severity had any practical effect. His authority soon began to be openly set at defiance. The Duchess of Montpensier, who was in the habit of promenading the streets of Paris with a pair of golden scissors at her waist, destined, as she boasted, to perform the ceremony of tonsure upon Henry when he exchanged his throne for a cloister, received a royal order to quit the capital. She treated it with utter unconcern, and continued to indulge in the same strain of insulting bravado with impunity. A preacher at St. Séverin had delivered himself in language so inflammatory and dangerous to the public peace, that it was impossible to avoid taking notice of it; but no sooner was it known that the myrmidons of justice were in quest of him, than the populace, incited by the

* P. de L'Estoile.

† Ibid., tom. i. p. 344.

clergy (especially by Boucher, who caused the tocsin to be rung from the steeple of his church of S. Benoit), rose en masse, attacked the royal archers with overwhelming numbers, and drove them out of the quartier in confusion.*

This first armed collision between the Leaguers and the Government was quickly followed by the "day of the barricades" (May 12, 1588), the events of which virtually dispossessed Henry of the crown. To say that the final downfall of the house of Valois was the work of the Gallican Church, would be an overstatement of the truth; but that it was brought about through the influence and agency of Gallican bishops and clergy is, unhappily, beyond a question.

The League was now the dominant power in France. The King was compelled, as the condition of retaining even the semblance of authority, to accept the "Edict of Union," which bound him to employ the whole strength of the kingdom for the extermination of the heretics, to declare heretics incapable of succeeding to the throne, and to abandon to the chief Leaguers all important posts of trust and command.† Among other promotions, Pierre d'Espinac, Archbishop of Lyons, one of the most turbulent intriguers of the time, was made a member of the Privy Council, and promised the reversion of the office of keeper of the seals. He was also recommended to the Pope for a cardinal's hat.

The States-General, which met immediately afterwards at Blois, consisted almost exclusively of nominees of the Duke of Guise and ardent apostles of the League. Among them we find the names of Claude de Saintes, Bishop of Evreux; Aymar Hennequin, Bishop of Rennes; and two Parisian curés, Cueilley and Pelletier. The "Seize," who were now omnipotent at Paris, laboured on this occasion to remodel the French monarchy, and reduce it to a popular constitutional government; proposing that the King should be made amenable to the judgment of the legislature in case of abuse of power; requiring that the States-General should be consulted before any proclamation of peace or war; and prohibiting all levying of taxes without their

* See the *Dialogue d'entre le Malheureux et le Manant*, a curious brochure of the time, printed in the third volume of the *Satyre Menippée*. It was com-

posed by Cromé, a member of the "Seize."

† Palma-Cayet, Introduction, p. 397.

express consent. They also provoked an acrimonious debate on the vexed question of the reception of the Council of Trent. Commissioners were named to confer with the law officers of the crown on the subject; one of whom, the Archbishop of Lyons, reviled the "Gallican liberties" as a mere human invention, a transparent device for subverting the authority of the Apostolic See, a specious veil for people of suspected opinions in religion, eager to conceal their errors by professing extraordinary zeal for the interests of the State. He was answered at length by the Avocat-General, who did not omit to taunt him with his anomalous antecedents; for in former days this versatile prelate had been a professed Calvinist, and was accused of having sacrificed his conscience to certain prospects of preferment held out to him as the price of conforming to the established Church. The dispute was continued by St. Gelais de Lansac, ci-devant ambassador of Charles IX. at Trent, who pompously eulogized the Council, and expatiated on the obligations of Catholics to submit to its decrees. He was sharply catechised by the Avocat-General as to the sentiments he had held upon these points twenty years before; and a scene of altercation followed, which became so tumultuous that it was judged necessary to close the sitting.*

These undignified squabbles were cut short by the portentous tidings of the assassination of the Duke of Guise. Over-elated by his successes, that haughty noble had proceeded to intolerable lengths of audacity; and Henry, pleading the universal right of self-defence, and the impossibility of dealing with such a criminal by any of the ordinary forms of executive justice, removed him from his path by a deliberate act of murder. His brother, the Cardinal of Guise, was despatched secretly in prison the next day. Within seven months afterwards the penalty of this great crime was exacted by the avenging dagger of Jacques Clement. Its immediate fruit was the outburst of a desperate revolt in Paris and the provinces, and the organization of a rebel government under the auspices of the League.

The clergy were the prime movers of the insurrection. On the first news of the catastrophe at Blois, Guincestre, or Lincestre, curé of St. Gervais, made a furious attack upon Henry

* Mezeraï, *Hist. du Règne de Henri III.*, tom. iii. p. 204 et seqq.

from the pulpit, calling him a "vilain Herodes" (an anagram of Henri de Valois), a poisoner, an assassin, and declaring that he had forfeited all claims to allegiance. In another discourse at St. Barthélemy, the same preacher called upon his congregation to hold up their hands and join in a solemn oath to expend the last denier in their purses and the last drop of blood in their veins in taking vengeance for the death of the two princes of Lorraine. Appealing by name to Achille de Harlai, first president of the Parliament, who was seated opposite the pulpit, Guincestre bade him raise his hand high—higher than the rest—so that all present might see it. A refusal, under the circumstances, might have been the signal for uproar and outrage, and de Harlai obeyed.* François Pigenat, curé of St. Nicolas des Champs, another incendiary orator, preached a funeral sermon for the Guises at Notre-Dame, in which he exhorted his hearers in plain terms to let nothing deter them from the righteous act of retribution which God and man alike demanded of them, namely the destruction of the tyrant who had shed the blood of the martyrs of Blois.

These harangues impelled the exasperated citizens to various acts of lawless excess. Many, however, still hesitated to commit themselves to an open revolt against the royal authority; and in order to overcome such scruples, the demagogues resorted to the Theological Faculty, in which they commanded a preponderating influence through Boucher, Prévost, Pigenat, and other doctors attached to their faction. The Sorbonne, in reply to this application, passed a decree to the effect that the people were released from their oath of allegiance and obedience to the King; and that they might with a safe conscience take arms and raise money for the defence of the Catholic Church against the wicked designs of the said king and his adherents, from the moment when he violated his faith publicly pledged to the maintenance of the Catholic religion, the Edict of Union, and the liberty of the States of the realm.

The decree was carried after a feeble resistance from a few more moderate divines; and was immediately transmitted to Rome for the approval and confirmation of the Apostolic See.†

* L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri III.*, tom. i. p. 379.

† L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri IV.*,

tom. i., p. 41. Mézerai, *Hist. du Règne de Henri III.*, tom. iii. p. 291. De Thou., Liv. xciv.

The Sorbonne now ordered the King's name to be erased from the formularies of the Church; and the customary "Domine, saluum fac Regem nostrum," was replaced by petitions "pro Principibus nostris Christianis." *

Such acts on the part of the illustrious Society which for three centuries had directed the conscience and governed the ecclesiastical policy of France, had an electrical effect upon the nation at large. Besides the metropolis and the Ile de France, all the large towns in the northern provinces, the whole of Burgundy and Champagne, the cities of Lyons and Toulouse, the greater part of Auvergne, Limousin, and Quercy, and, in short, the entire kingdom with the exception of a few towns on the Loire, renounced their allegiance to the King, and fraternized with the League and the Duke of Mayenne, its general-in-chief.

Paris was the centre of the rebellion. Here the Leaguers established their executive government, the "Council General of the Union," which consisted at first of forty members, and was afterwards increased to fifty-four. Of these tribunes of the people ten belonged to the clerical order; namely, four bishops, Louis de Brézé of Meaux, Guillaume Rose of Senlis, Nicolas de Villars of Agen, Aymar Hennequin of Rennes; five parish priests of Paris, Prévost of St. Séverin, Boucher of St. Benoît, Aubry of St. André, Pelletier of St. Jacques, Pigenat of St. Nicolas des Champs; and the canon of Soissons Matthieu de Launay.

The Council assumed all the attributes of sovereignty, including the disposal of ecclesiastical preferments in the gift of the Crown.

The principles represented by the League were somewhat heterogeneous and contradictory. Politically, it was democratical; religiously, it was extravagantly Ultramontane. The sovereignty of the people was one of its fundamental axioms. "It is the people that makes kings," cried the mob orators of Paris, "and the people, when it pleases, can unmake them." "The crown of France is not hereditary, but elective; we obey kings, but not tyrants." Similar sentiments had been lately broached in a work of some celebrity emanating from the school directly opposite, namely the "Franco-Gallia" of the Protestant

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxxviii. 83.

François Hotman. In the mouth of a Calvinist they might be natural and consistent; but they were paradoxical as coming from Catholics, who up to this time had been devoted to the strict monarchical theory, divine right and hereditary succession. Tyrants, the League proceeded to argue, may be lawfully resisted; certain delinquencies on the part of the chief magistrate of a State entail the loss of his authority; and for such failures he is responsible to public justice. From this doctrine they further deduced, and not illogically, the lawfulness of tyrannicide,—a dogma for which sufficient vindication was found in the Scriptural example of Judith and Holofernes, and others of like character.

These republican tendencies in politics the League combined with an absolute subjection of body and soul to the autocracy of Rome. The authority of the Vicar of Christ was paramount and universal; to him it belonged to dispose at his will of all thrones and dominions of this world; it was for him to settle all disputed questions and claims of sovereignty; and any course of action, any enterprise, became infallibly legitimate and safe from the moment when it was stamped with his sanction. Hence the League abjured the “Gallican liberties,” and everything else that tended to circumscribe the illimitable jurisdiction of the see of St. Peter.

It was a curious medley of two extreme currents of thought; the one originating in the freedom of judgment asserted by the Reformation, the other fraught with the spirit of Hildebrand, Innocent, and Boniface,—of mediæval theocracy.

The phenomenon may be partially explained by the fact that the position of the two great parties in this memorable struggle was now, by a singular turn of events, reversed. Henry III., finding himself forsaken and defenceless, formed a coalition with Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots, in the hope that he might thus confront the League with a superior force. The Huguenots, who till now had been regarded as the party factiously opposed to the Government, became by this step the champions of order, legitimacy, and constitutional authority; while the Leaguers, whose antecedents, as stanch Catholics, were those of firm attachment to the throne, were impelled into a course of reckless rebellion.

Yet, with all its alloy of violence and cruelty, of false ethics

and wild fanaticism, the League was a fight for real principles, and, as such, had attractions for earnest and superior minds.

We must not imagine that all its partisans were mere instruments of the ambition of the Guises; that their only motives were vanity and self-interest; that they wantonly and maliciously "turned faith into faction and religion into rebellion." Numbers there were to whom this description applied but too truly; but there were many of a very different stamp. There were those who conscientiously believed that the League was the only available means of obtaining reparation for the crying acts of injustice committed by the Crown against the National Church; there were those who thought the cause of true religion so grievously imperilled, that all other considerations were to be sacrificed without hesitation in its defence. Contemplating the state of affairs from the only point of view in which their education, their profession, and their convictions permitted them to regard it, such men were led to concentrate all their hopes for the salvation of France in the success of the League.

Among this class the first place must be assigned to Claude de Saintes, Bishop of Evreux. Whatever judgment we may pass upon the conduct of this great prelate in his later years, he must not be confounded with the herd of vulgar babblers who sought notoriety by pandering to the passions of a ferocious mob. Claude de Saintes was one of the most finished scholars and theologians of the age. In early life he was protected and advanced by the Cardinal of Lorraine, who sent him to study at the College of Navarre. Here he gained such a high reputation that he was chosen as one of the Catholic controversialists at the Colloquy of Poissy, and afterwards as one of the divines commissioned to represent the Sorbonne at the Council of Trent. Deeply convinced of the grave errors of Protestantism, de Saintes opposed it with all the force of a commanding intellect and an energetic will; and his success in combating heresy, together with the vast learning displayed in his elaborate treatise on the Eucharist, procured his elevation, in 1575, to the episcopal see of Evreux. It was now that he allowed himself, unfortunately for his own peace, to be carried away by the revolutionary torrent of the League. He instigated his flock to rise in arms, and it was through his personal efforts that the

city of Evreux and the whole diocese engaged in the rebellion. He even sold the ancient hotel belonging to his see in the Faubourg S. Antoine at Paris, and employed the proceeds in promoting the cause of the insurgents.* Evreux having been at length captured by the royal troops, the bishop fled to Louviers, where he was arrested by order of Henry IV., and sent prisoner to Caen, to take his trial before the parliament of Normandy. He was convicted of having publicly applauded the murder of Henry III., and of having intimated that his successor might lawfully be consigned to the same fate. Thereupon he was condemned to death; but, at the earnest intercession of the Cardinal de Bourbon, the king commuted the capital penalty into that of imprisonment for life. Claude de Saintes was now transferred to the château of Crèvecœur near Lisieux; and there, after a brief captivity, he breathed his last in October, 1591. His remains were interred in the Cathedral of Evreux.

A like example is on record in the history of Gilbert Génébrard, Archbishop of Aix. He was a man passionately devoted from his youth to learned study; profoundly versed in theological lore; an exact canonist, a renowned linguist, and Professor of Hebrew in the Collège de France. Such was his place in the estimation of the ecclesiastical world, that when he went to Rome, Pope Sixtus V. and the Sacred College gave him a public reception, with marks of almost unexampled honour. Pierre Danès, bishop of Lavaur, the same who figured so conspicuously at the Council of Trent, proposed to resign his see in favour of Génébrard; but there were obstacles which prevented this arrangement. A man with such pursuits and such a character would hardly be thought likely to precipitate himself into all the turmoil and danger of a popular insurrection; yet when the League broke out, there was no one who embraced it with a more delirious enthusiasm than Gilbert Génébrard.

He published a treatise to prove that all persons joining in communion or any religious rite with Henry III., after the murder of the Cardinal de Guise, were *ipso facto* excommunicate.† He declaimed furiously at Paris against the pre-

* *Gallia Christiana*, tom. xi. p. 612.

† De clericis qui participarent in divinis scienter et sponte cum Henrico

Valesio post Cardinalicidium assertio. —8vo., 1589.

tensions of Henry IV., and advocated the repeal of the Salic law, with the undisguised object of procuring the advancement of a Spanish Infanta to the throne of France. This anti-national, unpatriotic policy he supported further by signing, with three other divines, a letter addressed by the "Seize" to Philip II., assuring him that all good Catholics earnestly longed to see him wielding the French sceptre, and entreating him, if he could not come to reign over them in person, to make choice of a son-in-law, whom they pledged themselves to recognize as king.* This measure was the fruit of an intrigue by a secret knot of the most desperate among the Leaguers, called the "Council of Ten," who opposed themselves to the Duke of Mayenne and the moderate party, and achieved momentary predominance by deeds of ruthless cruelty and bloodshed. This Council of Ten was headed by the Curé Boucher, who for a short time became all-powerful, and was dignified with the title of "King of the League."

Terrorism reigned for some weeks in Paris; but the effect of these excesses was to strengthen the hands of Mayenne, and ere long he succeeded in putting an end to the ascendancy of the Seize. Meanwhile Générard was nominated by the Council of the Union to the archbishopric of Aix, in Provence, of which he took possession in September, 1592. Here he passed some years in comparative retirement, and composed one of his ablest works, a treatise on ecclesiastical elections,† in which he inveighed with masterly force against the pernicious usurpations of the Concordat.

From that fatal invasion of the liberties of the Gallican Church, properly so called, the author deduces, by a regular succession of cause and effect, the whole series of calamities which befell the house of Valois. It is true that men of extreme views and headstrong temper seldom find much difficulty in making facts correspond with their foregone conclusions; but in the present instance the chain of argument was so solid and so powerfully sustained as to extort a general assent, even from

* Palma-Cayet, *Chronologie Nove-naire*, Liv. iii. Villeroy, *Mémoires d'Etat*, tom. iii. p. 17. The letter is dated September 10, 1591.

† Liber de jure et necessitate sacram electionum ad Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ redintegrationem. See Nicéron, *Vies des Hommes Illustres*, tom. xxii. p. 17.

sober and impartial minds. The parliament of Provence took the alarm; the book was denounced as a virtual attack on the Gallican liberties, which it undoubtedly was, according to the modern and spurious sense of that much-abused phrase; and was condemned to be publicly burned at Aix. The tide of reaction now ran strongly in favour of the Bourbon monarchy, and the democratic theories of the League were renounced and execrated on all sides. G  n  brard was driven from his archbishopric, and sentenced to perpetual banishment from France. The latter punishment, however, was remitted by the clemency of Henry IV., and he was allowed to retire to an abbey which he possessed in Burgundy; here his death occurred shortly afterwards, in 1596.

Fanaticism, it appears from these and like instances, must not be identified with ignorance. It may co-exist with a high degree of mental cultivation; with learning, with experience, with genuine piety. Men of the type of Claude de Saintes and G  n  brard were, after all, but fallible mortals, liable both to moral and intellectual aberration. They were betrayed into excesses which are altogether indefensible. Yet it must be acknowledged that none were better qualified than they to determine the merits of the questions in dispute; and if *they* were driven into rebellion—believing *in foro conscienti  * that the cause they had espoused was the cause of truth and of God’s Church—the condition of affairs, ecclesiastical and civil, must have been desperate indeed.

The unbridled license of the popular preachers ruined the cause of the League. The rebellion reached its climax in January, 1593, when the States-General assembled at Paris, under the presidency of Mayenne, to proceed to the election of an orthodox King of France. It now became apparent that, after four years and more of ceaseless garrulity, caballing, and agitation of all kinds, the most hopeless dissension and perplexity still prevailed upon the grand question of the future government of the country. The pretenders to the throne were numerous;—the King of Spain and his daughter Isabella Clara Eugenia; the Duke of Mayenne and his two younger brothers; two princes of the House of Savoy; to say nothing of the heretic “B  arnois,” nor of those members of his family who adhered to

the ancient faith. Each of these claimants had his knot of zealous supporters in the Assembly. The moderate Leaguers, who were disposed to come to terms with the king, had gained ground rapidly since the suppression of the Seize, and were strongly represented among the deputies of the Tiers Etat. Every day the royal cause gained fresh adherents in the capital. Reasonable men on all sides began to agree as to the true remedy to be applied to existing evils; and to see that, if the king could only be persuaded to declare himself a Catholic, his success was a matter of certainty. There was still, indeed, a strong party devoted to the interests of Spain; and it seems not improbable that if at this juncture Philip had frankly announced his intention to bestow the Infanta in marriage on the young Duke of Guise, and to propose them as joint candidates for the throne, the League might yet have triumphed, and Henry IV. might never have reigned. The Spanish envoys made a distinct proposition of this nature to the three Chambers on the 21st of June; but it was then too late. Bishop Rose, Boucher, and other clerical demagogues, had declared in favour of maintaining the Salic law against all foreign pretensions; and this seems to have had a decisive effect upon public opinion. The friends of peace at Paris began to negotiate in secret with the Politiques of Henry's temporary court at Chartres, with a view to arrange terms of accommodation; and it was not long before it became publicly known that some such project was on foot. The plan proposed was simple; it consisted in sending a deputation to invite or summon (*sémondre*) the king to reconcile himself to the Catholic Church. Those who advocated this course were styled the "sémonneux;" and upon them the fanatic preachers now poured forth all the vials of their vindictive wrath. They scouted as impious all idea of pacification with the Béarnois, even though he should abjure his heresy and conform to the Church. Boucher and Pelletier excommunicated any of their parishioners who might dare to hold the slightest intercourse, even in matters of ordinary commerce, with the abhorred Politiques. But they stormed and raved in vain. Instead of inspiring fear, they excited ridicule; and it was obvious that their dominion was rapidly declining. In defiance of the Papal legate and the Spanish ambassador, of the anathemas thundered from the pulpits, and the judicial determinations

of the Sorbonne* (at this time completely under Ultramontane dictation), the three Chambers agreed to propose a conference to the Catholics of the king's party; the offer was accepted, and the first meeting was fixed for the 29th of April, at the village of Suresnes. Protracted discussions now ensued (into the details of which it is needless to enter) between the Archbishop of Bourges, as chief commissioner for the Royalists, and the Archbishop of Lyons on behalf of the League; and the result was that Henry intimated his intention to seek special instruction forthwith at the hands of the Catholic divines,—allowing it to be understood that this measure was shortly to be followed by his public retraction of Calvinism and submission to the Church.

It was during the conferences at Suresnes that the Parliament of Paris took the memorable step which, by counteracting the dangerous pretensions of the Court of Spain, was the means of saving the independent nationality of France. On the 28th of June, 1593, the magistrates—assembled to the number of fifty-five presidents and councillors,—voted a resolution which declared any treaty for establishing a foreign prince or princess on the throne to be absolutely null and void, as made in contravention of the Salic law, and other fundamental laws of the kingdom.† The Duke of Mayenne, supported by the Spaniards, the legate, Cardinal de Pellevè, and other zealots, made a show of resisting this arrêt, but soon found it necessary to acquiesce. The States-General determined, almost immediately afterwards, to adjourn indefinitely the project of electing a king—the very purpose for which they were convoked; and thus acknowledged that they were incompetent to direct the public councils in this difficult emergency. These were significant proofs of a revolution in the temper of the nation, which was ere long to make itself decisively manifest. Before separating, the States-General of the League voted the reception “pure et simple” of the decrees of the Council of Trent. This was done in opposition

* The Sorbonne published a decree against the “*Semonneux*,” declaring their proceedings “seditious and impious, contrary both to the canon and civil law, opposed to the admonition of the Pope (Clement VIII.) to the oath of the Holy Union, and to the glory which Paris had acquired in the eyes of God and man.” They were, in

consequence, pronounced “bad citizens, disturbers of the public peace, suspected abettors of heresy, and excommunicate.”—L’Estoile, *Journal de Henri IV.*, an 1593.

† *Mémoires de la Ligue*, tom. v. p. 377. Palma-Cayet, *Chronol. Noveuaire*, Liv. v.

to the report of a commission headed by the President Lemaître, which specified twenty-three articles as "contrary to the laws of the realm, the authority of the Crown, and the Gallican liberties." *

The famous 'Satyre Menippée,' which was circulated in manuscript in 1593, and published in the following year, may be said to have given the finishing stroke to the discomfiture of the League. Four editions of this curious work were exhausted in four weeks. It was the joint production of six ingenious authors;—Leroy, a canon of Rouen; Gillot, a canon of the Sainte Chapelle at Paris; Pierre Pithou, a well-known advocate of the Parliament; Nicolas Rapin, Florent Chrétien, and a Protestant named Passerat. Their chief object was to throw ridicule upon the meeting of the States-General lately summoned by Mayenne. The principal personages who figured there are introduced under slightly disguised names, and the harangues of the Cardinal-Legate Gaetano, Cardinal de Pellevè, Bishop Rose, and above all, of Aubray, the mouth-piece of the 'Tiers Etat,' are parodied with infinite spirit and humour; the peculiar style of each orator being closely imitated, while at the same time they are made to commit themselves with such ludicrous simplicity, that the general effect is irresistible. Sarcasm has ever been a weapon of peculiar potency in France; and the 'Satyre Menippée' contributed scarcely less to the ultimate triumph of Henry IV. than his most brilliant achievements in the field of battle.

Almost at the same moment Pierre Pithou, the parliamentary advocate just named in connection with the 'Satyre Menippée,' published his celebrated treatise on the 'Liberties of the Gallican Church.' In estimating the merits of this performance we must remember that it dates from an epoch when the passions of party raged on all sides with reckless violence. The trite proverb that "extremes reproduce each other" has never been more notably verified than in the history of the conflict between Ultramontanism and Gallicanism. The League, under the pressure of a danger which seemed to threaten the very vitals of the Church, exaggerated the powers of the Roman Pontiff, both spiritual and temporal, to an extent which had

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. clxxx. 69.

never been surpassed, if it had been equalled, in days when the monarchies of Europe were comparatively feeble and insecure. But when the League lost credit, and the Bourbons were in the ascendant, there was a manifest temptation to exhibit the opposite theory in stronger colours than the facts of history precisely warranted; and Gallican writers were not slow to improve the opportunity. Pithou observes, in the dedication of his book to Henry IV., that, amid the confusion and disorders which overspread the kingdom, some men, through malice and ambition, calumniated—others, through ignorance and apathy, despised—those noble rights and that precious Palladium which had been religiously preserved by the wisest of their ancestors, under the title of the liberties of the Gallican Church. In order to refresh the memory of the existing generation, and to hand down to posterity truths which he considered so invaluable, he had undertaken to compile the present treatise; which he humbly inscribes to the king, inasmuch as, in his capacity of “eldest son of the Church,” and in an especial manner as patron and protector of the Church of his own kingdom, he had the first and principal interest in the matters therein handled.

The volume consists of a collection of traditions, precedents, and maxims, recognised by the French law courts as their rule of practice in all causes affecting the relations between the temporal and the ecclesiastical powers. These are comprised in eighty-three articles. They are all founded upon two general principles, which are thus laid down in articles IV. and V. First, the Popes have no authority in temporal concerns within the realm of France; and, should they assume any such, the subjects of the French Crown, including the clergy, are not bound to pay regard to them. Secondly, although the Pope is acknowledged to be supreme in things spiritual, yet in France that supremacy is not absolute or boundless, but limited by the canons and decrees of the ancient Councils received in this kingdom; “and it is in this,” continues Pithou, “that the liberty of the Gallican Church primarily consists, as the University of Paris publicly testified in opposing the reception of Cardinal d’Amboise as papal legate.” But when he proceeds to interpret and apply these two fundamental maxims, the author is conducted to certain conclusions which, however acceptable to the Crown, the Parliament, and other lay authorities, were never

sanctioned by the Episcopate, and those who had a legitimate right to speak in the name of the Church. The manifest scope of many of Pithou's propositions is to intrude the secular jurisdiction into the ecclesiastical sphere. This appears especially in the articles relating to the powers of provincial Councils summoned by the king, to the "regale," to the practice of "appels comme d'abus," and to the right of the civil courts to give absolution "ad cautelam," under certain circumstances, from spiritual censures. In short, the work of Pithou must be regarded as the *Parliamentary* version of the Gallican liberties. For the ecclesiastical view of them we must consult ecclesiastical authorities; those great masters of French constitutional law who adorned the seventeenth century—Pierre de Marca, Edmond Richer, Louis Thomassin, Bossuet, Claude Fleury, and Ellies-Dupin.

The League, even after its decisive defeat, and the formal submission of its leaders to the Bourbon Government, continued to agitate the country by means of its incorrigible preachers, and was more or less a source of disquietude throughout the reign of Henry IV. The king, though averse to severity, was compelled to take measures for repressing the outrageous scurrilities which disgraced the pulpits; and Bishop Rose, the curés Aubry, Cueilly, Boucher, Pelletier, and Hamilton, Filleul, prior of the Carmelites, and some others, were deprived of their preferments and banished from Paris.* Guincestre and Pelletier professed themselves repentant, and were pardoned. Rose was, after a time, restored to his see, but was ungrateful enough to commit fresh acts of disloyalty, for which the Parliament inflicted upon him the humiliation of a public amende. The Jesuits, who had been foremost throughout in the rebel cause, were denounced by the University to the Parliament, condemned, after a splendid display of indignant oratory by the advocate Antoine Arnauld,† and sentenced to banishment from France. Two of the Order, Guignard and Gùeret, were convicted, though it appears unjustly, of being concerned in an attempt on the king's life; the former ‡ was capitally punished, the latter banished from the realm for life.

* See the list of the proscribed in L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri IV.*, tom. iii. p. 40. (Petitot, tom. xlvii.)

† *Mémoires de la Ligue*, tom. vi. p.

173. Palma-Cayet, *Chron. Noven.*, Liv. vi.

‡ Guignard had, no doubt, held seditious and treasonable language,

But the most mischievous result of the League was this; that, long after it was extinguished as a political faction, some of its favourite doctrines were perpetuated by a race of controversialists of no small ability and zeal, and that interminable conflicts were thus provoked with the divines of the opposite school, greatly to the detriment of the Church and of religion. The transcendental theory of the Papacy as dominating over all earthly thrones—this dominion being held to include the right to depose delinquent princes on the score of heresy, schism, or other spiritual crime; the tremendous corollary that princes thus deposed may lawfully be put to death; the necessity of waging war to the last extremity for the destruction of heretics; the personal infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff in determining matters of faith and morals;—these convictions survived the dissolution of the League, and were continually reproduced, especially in the writings and instructions of the Society of Jesus. Royalist and orthodox pens were never wanting to refute them; and the details of this chronic warfare occupy a considerable space in the history of the seventeenth century. The assaults of Mariana and Martin Bécán were repulsed by William Barclay; the great Bellarmine found a redoubtable antagonist in Edmond Richer; the University of Louvain fulminated its censures against the Jesuit Lessius; Father Garasse writhed under the scathing satire of St. Cyran. In short, the controversial history of France in the seventeenth century (and it was scarcely less controversial than the age preceding) may be characterized as that of a vigorous reaction on the one side against the pestilent fallacies of the League, and on the other of a struggle in defence of them, sustained—sometimes openly, sometimes covertly, but always substantially—by the disciples of Ignatius Loyola.

but language of that kind was constantly in the mouths of all the zealots of the League, and, moreover, it was unfair to take note of such offences after the act of amnesty which the king published on entering Paris. One of his sentiments was the following: "Que, en l'an 1572, au jour Sainct Barthélémy, si on eust saigné la veine basilique, nous ne fussions tombez de *fièvre en chaud mal*, comme nous expérimentions." Another was to this

effect: "Que le Béarnois, ores que converty à la foy Catholique, seroit traicté plus doucement qu'il ne méritoit si on lui donnoit la couronne monachale et quelque couvent bien reformé, pour aller faire penitence de tant de maux qu'il a fait à la France, et remercier Dieu de ce qu'il lui avoit fait la grace de se recoignoistre avant la mort."—Palma-Cayct, *Chron. Noven.*, Liv. vi. (Petitot, tom. xlii. p. 384.)

CHAPTER IV.

It has been too generally taken for granted that the reconciliation of Henry IV. with the Church of Rome was a mere act of political expediency—an act of violence to conscientious conviction. Any step of this kind, taken at a moment when it manifestly coincides with worldly interest, inevitably excites suspicion; and it must be confessed that the juncture at which the King announced his conversion was ill-chosen for inspiring belief in his sincerity. But it were hard measure to charge him with deliberate hypocrisy; to suppose that he knelt at the altar of St. Denis with a lie in his mouth and double-dealing in his heart. The truth was probably this. Henry could not help sympathizing to a great extent with the Huguenot *cause*; he was bound to it by early education, by the memory of many a gallantly-contested field of battle, and by close ties of personal friendship. But Protestantism as a system of *doctrine* was, to say the least, indifferent to him. In renouncing it, therefore, he cannot be said, religiously speaking, to have violated the law of conscience. On the contrary, it would seem that his religious instincts attracted him strongly towards Catholicism. Palma-Cayet tells us that he remarked to one of his domestic chaplains, before his abjuration, “I cannot see either order or devotion in this religion (the Reformed). It consists in nothing but a preachment (*un presche*), and this only means a tongue which can speak good French. Now, I have a notion that we ought to believe that the Body of our Saviour is actually present in the Sacrament; otherwise all that one does in religion is no better than a bare ceremony.”* The same annalist mentions that “God had *long previously* impressed the king’s mind with regard to the reality of the Eucharistic Presence,” and that “the only points upon which he was still in doubt were those

* Palma-Cayet, *Chronol. Noven.*, an 1593. (Petitot, tom. xli.)

of the invocation of saints, auricular confession, and the authority of the Pope." It was accordingly on these three latter doctrines that Henry consulted the Catholic divines at the conference held at Mantes on the 23rd of July, 1593. The clergy who took part in it were the Archbishop of Bourges, the Bishops of Nantes, Le Mans, and Chartres, Duperron bishop-designate of Evreux, and the curés of Paris Benoît, Morennes, and Chavagnac, who, from the first, had steadily supported the Bourbon cause in opposition to the League. The royal catechumen is said to have astonished these professed theologians by the acuteness of his questions and the ability with which he sustained the argument. They remained in deliberation for seven hours; at last the king said, "You have not altogether satisfied me; but the state of the case is this: I now place my soul in your hands; take good care how you deal with it; for wherever you conduct me, there I shall stay till the hour of my death, and that I most solemnly protest to you."* There is nothing in such language that savours of levity, far less of cant or conscious duplicity.

The sagacious Sully (himself a Protestant), who had better opportunities than any other person of knowing the real state of the king's mind, has recorded his belief that, while Henry was doubtless influenced at first by political considerations, he became persuaded in the end that the Catholic religion was the surer way of salvation.† He adds that, from the natural ingenuousness of the king's character, he would ill have supported, had the case been otherwise, such a disguise of his true sentiments for the rest of his life.

Henry made his public abjuration of Calvinism in the Abbey Church of St. Denis on Sunday the 25th of July, 1593; and was thereupon absolved provisionally (*ad cautelam*) and restored to the communion of the Church, by the Archbishop of Bourges. But although this event gave him at once a prestige and a vantage ground which nothing else could have procured, he found himself still surrounded by manifold embarrassments. The Pope's Legate declared the proceedings at St. Denis null and void, inasmuch as the French prelates had acted without

* L'Estoile, *Journal de Henri IV.*

† Sully, *Economies Royales*, tom. i. p. 483. Paris, 1822.

authority from Rome. Clement VIII. spoke of the king's conversion in terms of bitter contumely: "I would not believe Navarre to be a Catholic," said he to the Duke of Nevers, "unless an angel should come down from heaven and whisper it in my ear. As for the Catholics of his party, they are disloyal to religion and to the Crown; they are but the bastards of the bondmaid; the Leaguers are the legitimate children, the true pillars and buttresses of the Catholic religion."* The Court of Rome showed extreme reluctance to grant the absolution which was humbly craved on behalf of Henry by his envoys; and the protracted delays in this affair were seriously injurious, since a plausible justification was thus given to the continued enmity of the King of Spain and the fanatics of the League. Upon this pretext the king's life was twice attempted by assassins. The deed was openly defended on the ground that he was no true member of the Church, and not recognised by the Pope; consequently his murder was a lawful and a meritorious act.†

Of the rancorous hatred borne to Henry by the fanatical priesthood, even after his restoration to Catholic communion, we have a curious proof in the series of nine sermons "*Sur la simulée conversion de Henri de Bourbon*," preached by Jean Boucher in the Church of St. Merry.

These were published with the official approbation of the Sorbonne, in which it is stated that, "besides being grave and learned, they contain a wholesome doctrine, and an able exposure of false Catholicism and impious 'Politicism,' and thus confirm in a wonderful manner the wavering faith of numbers of Catholics in these unhappy times." The discourses abound with the foulest and most malignant abuse, intermixed with passages of considerable eloquence, and with a certain display of erudition. The main object of the preacher is to establish, from every possible point of view, the illegality and invalidity of the absolution pronounced by the Archbishop of Bourges. Collaterally he embraces a wide range of topics; he defends the principle of insurrection; asserts the plenary power of the Estates of the realm to regulate the succession to the throne

* Palma-Cayet, *Chronolog. Noven.*, Liv. v. p. 49. (Petitot, tom. xlii.)

† Several other acts of violence

against Henry's person are mentioned by the contemporary writers.

and the form of government; identifies the action of the League with that of the Church; exalts the Pope to an absolute supremacy, not only in spirituals but indirectly in temporals also; and combines an extravagant advocacy of the rights of the people with maxims of religious intolerance involving the duty of active persecution.

A reply to Boucher's Sermons was published by Claude d'Angennes, Bishop of Le Mans; in which he proved, by copious references to ecclesiastical canons and tradition, that the power of absolution in cases of heresy has been reserved in all ages to the bishops, independently of the See of Rome.

It was a special object with the Roman curia that Henry should solicit, not only absolution, but "*rehabilitation*," that is, the restitution of his rights as a temporal sovereign; which, of course, would have implied the admission that the Pope had power to deprive him of those rights, and restore them when he thought proper. This point the French commissioners, Cardinal d'Ossat and Du Perron, positively declined to concede. Clement insisted on it with great pertinacity, but, at length, found it necessary to yield, and ended by waiving it. It was represented to him that if he showed himself obdurate and intractable, Henry of Bourbon might lose patience, and France might be provoked to withdraw altogether from the obedience of Rome, after the melancholy example of England. It appears, indeed, that Henry had already been urged by some of his ablest counsellors to establish the Gallican Church upon the footing of national independence, under the presidency of a *patriarch*, nominated by himself. These and other considerations induced the Pope to take a more reasonable tone; and, after some further discussion, the conditions of the Absolution were finally arranged. They were as follows:—That the Catholic religion and worship should be re-established in Béarn, and other localities where it had been suppressed since the year 1585. That all ecclesiastical benefices and property which had been conferred upon heretics, laymen, and other disqualified persons, should be restored to the orthodox clergy. That the young Prince of Condé (at that time heir-presumptive to the throne, the king having no legitimate children) should be educated in the Catholic faith. That the king should give the preference to Catholics in the distribution of public offices

and dignities, and should let it be plainly seen that he desired the true Church to be dominant throughout the kingdom. That the decrees of the Council of Trent, as well of discipline as of doctrine, should be received and executed in France. To this latter stipulation the French ambassadors annexed a noticeable modifying clause;—"with the exception of any article which could not be executed *without causing disturbance in the kingdom.*"

Henry further promised, by way of "works of satisfaction," to hear mass regularly every day, and recite certain specified prayers; to approach the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist at least four times a year; and to establish convents and nunneries in different parts of the kingdom.* According to Sully's account, it was moreover *secretly* covenanted that the banished Jesuits should be recalled to France.

All preliminaries being adjusted, the ceremony of the absolution took place with great parade and solemnity on the 17th of September, 1595. The Pope seated himself on a throne raised on a lofty platform in front of St. Peter's, the doors of the cathedral being closed. Henry's representatives Cardinal d'Ossat and Du Perron, Bishop of Evreux, prostrated themselves at the feet of the Holy Father, and in the name of their Sovereign abjured all heresy, swore upon the Gospels to maintain the true faith inviolate, accepted the above-named conditions of penitential discipline, and promised the same submission and obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff that had always been paid by the Most Christian kings.

The choir then intoned the Miserere; and during the performance the Pope administered to the kneeling prelates a gentle symbolical chastisement with a slender staff. At its conclusion he pronounced the impressive words of absolution in due form; whereupon the great multitude who thronged the square of St. Peter's rent the air with acclamations. The Pope, turning to the French envoys, charged them to tell their master that, since he was now re-admitted into the fold of the Church Militant, it remained for him to merit, by soundness of faith and fruitfulness in good works, a glorious entrance hereafter into the Church triumphant.†

* De Thou, Liv. 113. *Contin. de* |
Fleury, Liv. clxxxi. 37.

† Palma-Cayet, *Chron. Noven.*, Liv. vii. (Petitot, tom. xliii.)

This authoritative recognition of Henry of Bourbon as the "eldest son of the Church" deprived the Leaguers, the "Tiers-parti," and all other malcontents among the Catholics, of every conceivable pretext for further disturbing the peace of France. They accordingly laid down their arms, and signified their adhesion to the king's government, on all sides; and within four months after the absolution at Rome, the definitive treaty was signed with the Duke of Mayenne at Folembrai, which formally put an end to the existence of the League.

But with the Huguenots Henry had much more difficulty. They continued to show themselves sullen, jealous, factious, unreasonable. Their leaders—Rohan, Bouillon, La Tremoille,—had abandoned the court, and were agitating in various parts of the country for a renewal of the civil war. In some of the most critical emergencies of the struggle with Spain—such for instance as the siege of La Fère and the capture of Amiens—the Protestants remained stubbornly deaf to the appeals of their sovereign for assistance; indeed his moments of embarrassment and distress were precisely those which they chose for worrying him with fresh demands and exorbitant pretensions. No sooner was it known that Henry had opened negotiations for peace with the King of Spain, than the Huguenot synod appointed delegates to proceed forthwith to England and Holland, for the purpose of intriguing with Elizabeth and the Prince of Orange to defeat the proposed treaty. Such conduct was the more unjustifiable, inasmuch as the Reformers had in reality very little to complain of at this period. The edict of 1577, which was legally in full force, secured to them substantial toleration, and even a considerable share of political power; and if that edict was not always perfectly observed, the cause lay, for the most part, in the violent proceedings of the Huguenots themselves in those districts where their creed predominated, and in the general distrust which they inspired as dangerous revolutionary agitators.

Further concessions, however, were indispensable under the pressure of existing circumstances. In March, 1597, Henry appointed as his commissioners Count Gaspard de Schomberg, the historian Jacques Auguste de Thou (one of the Presidents of the Parliament of Paris), and the Councillors of State De Vic and Calignon; who immediately proceeded to treat for a

final settlement with the Protestant Assembly sitting at Loudun. Several months elapsed before a satisfactory understanding could be arrived at; and it was not till the 15th of April, 1598, that Henry was enabled to put the seal to this great work of national pacification by publishing the Edict of Nantes.

The preamble to this most important document, the Magna Charta of Protestant liberty in France, specifies, curiously enough, as the royal motive for issuing it, the necessity of completely and securely re-establishing the *Catholic* religion in those localities where it had been abolished during the last troubles; viz., Béarn, La Rochelle, Nismes, Montauban, &c. "Now that it had pleased God to grant repose to the kingdom from the destructions of civil war, the king felt it his duty to make provision for the public worship and service of God among all classes of his subjects; and if it was impossible at present that all could be brought to agree in one and the same external form of worship, at all events there might be uniformity of spirit and purpose; and such regulations might be adopted as should obviate all danger of public disturbance or collision. Accordingly he had determined to enact and promulgate a law upon this subject—universal, distinct, positive, and absolute—a perpetual and *irrevocable* edict, and he prayed God that his subjects might be led to accept it, as the surest guarantee of their union and tranquillity, and of the re-establishment of the French empire in its ancient power and splendour."

Then follow the enacting clauses, comprised in ninety-two articles. Those who professed the "so-called Reformed Religion" were to enjoy henceforth full and complete liberty of conscience, and the free exercise of their public worship throughout the realm of France, though not without certain restrictions.

All seigneurs possessing the right of "haute justice" might assemble for worship with their families, their tenants, and any others whom they chose to invite; land-owners of a lower grade were not to hold meetings consisting of more than thirty persons. Huguenots were to be freely admitted to all colleges, schools, and hospitals; they might found, endow, and maintain, educational and charitable institutions; and their religious books might be published in all places where their worship was authorized. They were to be eligible to all public employments

on equal terms with Catholics, and on accepting office were not to be bound to take any oaths, or attend any ceremonies repulsive to their conscience. A new court, called the "Chambre de l'Edit," was instituted in the Parliament of Paris, composed of a president and sixteen councillors, of whom one, or two at the most, were to be Protestants. Other similar courts were established in Guienne, Languedoc, and Dauphiné. These were to take cognizance of all cases arising between Protestants and Catholics.

Besides the privilege granted to the holders of fiefs, the Reformed worship was legalised in one town or village in every bailliage throughout France. In certain specified places, however, it was altogether *prohibited*; at the court, or residence of the sovereign for the time being; at Paris, and within a radius of five leagues round the capital; and in all military camps, with the exception of the personal quarters of a Protestant general. It was also excluded from Reims, Dijon, Soissons, Beauvais, Sens, Nantes, Joinville, and other towns, in virtue of separate arrangements made by Henry with the local nobles. The Huguenots were enjoined to show outward respect to the Catholic religion, to observe its holy-days, and to pay tithes to its clergy. They were to desist from all political negociations and cabals, both within and beyond the realm; their provincial assemblies were to be forthwith dissolved; and the king engaged to license the holding of a representative synod once in three years, with the privilege of addressing the Crown on the condition of the Reformed body, and petitioning for redress of grievances.

There were, in addition, fifty *secret* articles, which did not appear on the face of the edict. By one of these the king confirmed the Huguenots in possession (for eight years) of all the cautionary towns which had been granted to them by the treaty 1577. Several of these were places of considerable strength and importance; including La Rochelle, Montauban, Nismes, Montpellier, Grenoble, Lectoure, Niort, &c. The expense of maintaining the Huguenot garrisons was to be defrayed by a royal grant of 80,000 crowns per annum.

That the Edict of Nantes should have excited keen dissatisfaction and determined opposition among the Catholic subjects of Henry, is, of course, no matter of surprise. The prelates,

the clergy, the University, and the parliaments both of Paris and the provinces, remonstrated against it in the most energetic and unmeasured language; and it required all the authority, resolution, judgment, and eloquence of Henry, together with the support of his most enlightened counsellors, to bring the affair to a successful conclusion. The Parliament of Paris persisting in its refusal to register the edict, the magistrates were summoned to the Louvre, where the king addressed them in an admirable speech, full of mingled dignity, pathos, and cogent reasoning, not without occasional touches of menace and reproach. This, it may be hoped, produced conviction; at any rate it was followed by speedy compliance. The edict was registered, and thus became part of the statute law of France, on the 25th of February, 1599.

There can be no question that, in publishing the Edict of Nantes, Henry IV. was actuated to a great extent by anxiety to secure to his Huguenot subjects the blessings of a real, effectual, and permanent toleration. But at the same time it is certain that this was not his only motive in taking that step. His views of policy were broader, more comprehensive, more truly statesmanlike. He knew that Protestantism in France was a struggle even more for political, than for religious, power and predominance; and his grand object was to bring the contest to an end, by depriving the Reformers of every reasonable pretext for disaffection. If they were once content as to their civil pretensions, he was convinced that they would be comparatively harmless as a sect of dissenters from the established creed.

So long as they were persecuted, so long as they were burdened by vexatious disabilities, and separated by invidious distinctions from the mass of their fellow-citizens; so long had the Huguenots steadily increased and multiplied, until their existence had become a standing and most serious peril to the tranquillity of France. Henry's plan was to reduce them to submission, loyalty, and insignificance, simply by giving them nothing to complain of. He had witnessed the wretched results of bigotry, tyranny, unjust legislation, sectarian rancour and hatred; and he was resolved, now that he had the opportunity, to try the effects of an opposite system—of charity, equity, forbearance, and impartial respect for the rights of conscience.

In taking this course, the king believed that he was consulting the true interests of the French monarchy, of society at large, and of the Catholic Church itself.

He was quite prepared, however, to find the proposed measure vehemently censured and resisted in certain quarters, and especially by the Court of Rome.

In his communications with the Pope at this period he took especial pains to justify himself beforehand for a measure which must naturally appear so suspicious in the eyes of the Holy Father, and to dispel the apprehensions excited by it. "If I am compelled," he writes in March, 1598, "to make greater concessions to the Huguenots than those of the edict of 1577, let his Holiness be assured that I do it solely for the purpose of avoiding a more serious evil, and with a view to protect and strengthen the Catholic Church to a corresponding extent; that I do it to appease and satisfy the so-called Reformers, and by that means to defeat the more easily the designs of the ambitious and factious among them, who are doing their utmost to make the rest despair of my protection, and to stir them up against the Catholics who still live in great numbers in the towns which they occupy, and from which they would already have expelled them by force if I had not interfered." *

Again, a few weeks after the publication of the edict;—"I have well considered what his Holiness has said to you † with reference to the edict which I have issued in order to restore peace to my kingdom; and I trust that time will convince him that the assurances you have given of my real intentions are more to be relied on than the reports which he has heard from others to my disadvantage." And some months later he writes to the Pope himself:—"I shall take care so to manage the edict which I have published for the tranquillity of my kingdom, *that its most important and most solid results shall be in favour of the Catholic religion*; and this indeed is already beginning to appear." ‡

These anticipations were remarkably fulfilled. Within a year after the appearance of the edict we find Henry congratulating himself on having recovered the confidence of the Sovereign Pontiff, with regard to his designs "for the glory of

* *Lettres Missives de Henri IV.*, vol. iv., p. 921.

† Cardinal de Joyeuse.

‡ *Lettres Missives*, Nov. 1599.

God, and the restoration of his Church." The wisdom of his tolerant policy had quickly become manifest, not only by the entire cessation of civil strife, but by an extraordinary revival of zeal and vigour which sprung up internally in the French Church, and by a no less wonderful reaction towards Catholicism proceeding simultaneously among the Huguenots themselves. No sooner did the sectaries find themselves fully protected by the law, and admitted to the free enjoyment of all the rights belonging to French citizens, than their religious bigotry began sensibly to abate. Their prejudices gradually melted away before the fervid exhortations, the unwearied energy, the acute and weighty reasonings, of the Catholic clergy and missionaries; and the result was seen in a long series of memorable conversions. In short, if Henry IV. had needed any justification of his indulgence to the Protestants in granting them the Edict of Nantes, he had only to point to the prosperous aspect of the Church, and the general strengthening of the Catholic interest throughout France. The ambassador d'Halincourt, on proceeding to Rome in 1605, was instructed to call the special attention of the Pope to this encouraging fact. "The Catholic religion, fostered as it is by the authority and solicitude of his Majesty, is visibly regaining its ancient strength and splendour. It is notorious to all men that it has made greater progress during the six or seven years since the re-establishment of peace, by the wise measures taken by his Majesty, than it ever did during the wars of the late kings Charles and Henry; France having discovered, to her cost, that the evils arising from diversity of religious opinions, when they have taken deep root in a nation, are to be assuaged rather by gentleness and moderation than by harshness and violence."

The Edict of Nantes, then, must not be regarded merely as an act of arbitrary indulgence to the Calvinists; it must not be separated from the general scheme of Henry's far-sighted and well-balanced policy. The grant of religious freedom to the Protestants formed part, but *only* a part, of that which was the paramount object and work of Henry's reign—the restoration of peace, security, unity,—social, political, and ecclesiastical,—to France. His peculiar antecedents enabled him to pursue a path which to his predecessors had been impracticable; to maintain a powerful State Establishment without violating the

rights and liberties of dissentient sects; to protect the Church without irritating or oppressing the Nonconformists. In no other way could he have stanchèd the bleeding wounds of his country; nor could any one have accomplished it but himself. Neither of the two rival camps of the "wars of religion," had its councils exclusively prevailed, could have saved France from ruin. The Leaguers were in arms against their lawful sovereign; the Huguenots, apostates from the ancient faith, were offensive to the religious instincts of the great mass of the nation. But Henry, when once he had become a Catholic prince, the "eldest son of the Church," combined in himself all the required elements of mediation and reunion. He annihilated the League by satisfying the very principle for which the League had been all along professedly contending; he silenced the Huguenots by redressing their grievances, and raising them to a degree of political importance of which their most sanguine partisans had scarcely dreamed.

With regard to his external and international relations, Henry availed himself in like manner, and with equal success, of these happy circumstances of his position. Only a few weeks after issuing the Edict of Nantes, he signed the scarcely less important Peace of Vervins with the Spanish branch of the House of Austria. Spain and the Empire had hitherto been regarded as the main bulwarks of Catholicism in Europe; and so long as France was distracted and enfeebled by the wars of the League, their predominance was indisputable. But, under the skilful guidance of Henry IV., France speedily recovered her just influence. Not only did he conclude an advantageous peace with Spain, but he contrived, with admirable tact, to attach to himself and to France all the principal States which were adverse to the Spanish and Austrian interest; and the confederacy thus formed was so powerful as to make him virtually the arbiter of Europe.

The Holy See acknowledged him as its most strenuous defender. He charmed the minor powers of Italy with the dazzling prospect of Italian unity and independence. He maintained a confidential correspondence with Maurice of Hesse and other Lutheran princes of Germany. He negotiated on terms of friendship with Elizabeth and James I. of England. Above all, he entered into a treaty of strict alliance with the

United Provinces of Holland; he upheld their cause with unflagging zeal and ability through a long labyrinth of tedious negotiations; and it was in no small degree owing to him that they triumphed in the end, by the formal recognition of their independence in the treaty of April, 1609.

Thus auspiciously did the seventeenth century dawn for the interests of France. After the destructive tempests of the civil wars, the nation began to revive and to breathe freely; and men of all parties joined in heartfelt aspirations for the blessings of settled peace, social order, and legitimate government. Even the most thoughtless of that generation had learned lessons amid the calamities of their youth which brought forth wholesome fruit in their maturer years. The conciliatory spirit and patriotic example of Henry IV. won by degrees a widespread sympathy throughout the nation. His clemency rebuked the fierceness of religious partisanship; his long experience, his remarkable success, the sincerity of his character, were appreciated even by those who had opposed him the most bitterly, and influenced public opinion in a thousand ways.

In all directions Religion was now invoked as the true source and most certain pledge of tranquillity and happiness, public and private. During the first quarter of the seventeenth century France was thoroughly penetrated by the spirit of religious enterprise. The mere catalogue of public institutions of different kinds which originated in this memorable movement is long enough to fill several printed pages; men of all ranks and professions vied with each other in forming associations for various purposes of beneficent exertion, spiritual and temporal. Colleges, schools, hospitals, missions at home and abroad, congregations for the systematic training of the clergy, diocesan seminaries, the reformation of many monastic orders and conventual houses—societies devoted to the education of the young, to the relief of the poor, to the support and consolation of the aged, to the visitation of prisoners, to the redemption of captives—such are some of the characteristic undertakings of the times we are about to contemplate.

CHAPTER V.

THE "Wars of religion" had left the Church of France in a state of miserable depression and disorder. From an official report made to the King by the Assembly of the clergy in 1595,* we learn that at that time three-fourths of the parochial churches were unprovided with legitimate pastors. Out of fourteen archiepiscopal sees, six or seven were without occupants; from thirty to forty bishoprics were vacant out of a total of about a hundred; and several of the existing prelates had been elected uncanonically and by discreditable means. With regard to abbeys, the destitution was still worse; in twenty-five dioceses there were one hundred and twenty conventual houses without qualified superiors. "These foundations," said the Bishop of Le Mans, who spoke on this occasion on behalf of the clergy, "are managed as to temporal matters (the spiritual administration is scarcely thought of at all), by certain laymen, who appropriate the revenues dedicated by the founders to the service of God, and enjoy them under the name of some hireling substitute. The spiritual rule and government of these houses, which is a matter of Divine right, and for which persons of the highest merit for piety and learning ought to be chosen, is sold for hard cash, bestowed as a marriage portion, bartered for worldly goods, and this openly, with the knowledge of your Majesty and your Council. The fold being thus deprived of true shepherds, the sheep are scattered abroad, and the ravening wolf, finding none to oppose him, preys upon them at his will. The sins thereby committed draw down upon us the wrath of God, and make the service of His Church offensive to Him." The bishop proceeded to entreat the king to restore to the Church the right of free election; and to authorise the publication of the bulls of Pius V. and Sixtus V. against "confidences."† "Such elections would

* *Procès-verbaux des Assembl. du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 576. Palma-Cayet, *Chronol. Noven.*, Liv. vii.

† A "confidence" is a contract by which an ecclesiastic receives a benefice on condition of paying the emoluments,

fill our ranks with learned divines, faithful pastors, and able rulers, who would raise the Church in this realm into a flourishing condition; while the constitutions we refer to, if published and executed, would remove the curse that now lies upon us by reason of the crying sin of simony." The clergy complain further, that the civil power had lately made bold encroachments on the spiritual; the Grand Conseil having taken upon itself to grant to its own nominees ecclesiastical preferment of all kinds, even the highest; and to such a scandalous extent had this been carried, that children, mere schoolboys, were placed in the position of spiritual heads and governors of religious houses. The Council had also presumed to grant dispensations of marriage, licences for plurality of benefices, and absolutions for canonical irregularities—matters belonging exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Sovereign Pontiff. In conclusion, they express their hope that, as his Majesty naturally desired that those things which are Cæsar's should be rendered to Cæsar, so he would not be less solicitous to render to God the things which be God's.

The king, in his reply, promised to do his utmost to remedy the abuses and corruptions specified; and in particular, he declared that vacancies in the episcopate should henceforth be filled by persons competent to preach, and to execute all other duties of their office. At the same time he administered a sharp rebuke to the clergy, whose personal misconduct was, in his Majesty's judgment, the main cause of existing evils. He accused them of having instigated the aggressive interference of foreign powers in France; of scandalous maladministration of their dioceses; of caring little for the honour of God in comparison with their own interest, convenience, and enjoyment; of squandering upon mere worldly objects the revenues which should be consecrated to the work of the Church. To such causes, he said, he attributed the rise and growth of religious dissension in the kingdom; and if the clergy desired to see a return to unity and concord, they must undertake in good earnest their own part in the work of general reformation. It

or a part of them, to a third person; or covenants to resign the preferment at a specified time. The person holding a benefice on such terms is called a "con-

fidentiaire." The engagement is simoniacal. Hélicourt, *Lois Eccles. de France*, F. chap. xx. 28, 29. *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. viii. p. 8.

was the first and indispensable condition of improvement that they should set an edifying example to the people by word and deed. This was the true method to appease the wrath of God, to secure success in public affairs, and to make converts to the Catholic religion. If he could once see the ecclesiastical body thoroughly reformed, he would engage to bring back the Huguenots to the bosom of the Church.*

Very similar representations were made by the clerical Assemblies of 1598, 1600, 1602, and 1605. On the latter occasion, in addition to the usual denunciations of simony, uncanonical elections, and mismanagement of Church property, the clergy urgently petitioned for the publication of the Council of Trent. They reminded the king that the same desire had been repeatedly expressed before, both by General Assemblies and by provincial Councils. It was grievous that France, which had for its sovereign the "eldest son of the Church," should have the appearance of being schismatic, and disobedient to injunctions so sacred, to decrees enacted so unquestionably under the guidance of the Divine Spirit. How long were human reasonings to prevail in opposition to the behests of Heaven? How long was the sacred to give way to the secular, the will of God to the cavillings of man? If there was anything in the Tridentine statutes that seemed inconsistent with the legislation of France, it was, in fact, of so small importance, that in a single conference between the bishops, the Council of State, and the Parliament, they would engage that perfect satisfaction should be given to his Majesty on that head.

In answer to this harangue, the King fully admitted the magnitude of the evils under which the Church still laboured; and, with respect to the Council of Trent, assured the clergy that he was as anxious as they themselves could be to see it duly promulgated. "But, as you remind me very truly," said Henry, taking a somewhat unfair advantage of an expression which had fallen from the Archbishop of Vienne, "considerations of temporal policy sometimes come into collision with the dictates of heavenly wisdom." At the same time he promised that no effort should be spared on his part to promote the efficiency of the Church and the triumph of true religion; and he took

* *Procès-verbaux des Assembl. du Clergé*, tom. i. p. 584.

the prelates present to witness that he had never bestowed preferment on any but well-qualified persons. This course had already produced a considerable change for the better, and by adhering to it a still further improvement might be expected for the future. As to the simoniacal practices complained of, it was for those among the clergy who felt themselves justly chargeable with such offences to make voluntary reparation by resigning forthwith the preferments thus unlawfully acquired;—an example which would demonstrate their sincerity as Church reformers, and which could not fail to have a powerful effect upon the minds of the laity.*

The dilapidated and ruinous condition of ecclesiastical buildings was another pitiable feature of the Church of France at this epoch. The ‘*Gallia Christiana*’ enumerates upwards of 150 cathedral and abbey churches which had been demolished by the Huguenots. This list does not include the parochial churches ravaged by the sectaries in places captured by their troops, such as Orleans, Soissons, Auxerre, Montpellier, Nismes, Montauban, Castres, and others. In the district of Beauce three hundred churches were destroyed: five hundred shared the same fate in the dioceses of Uzès, Viviers, Nismes, and Mende. Fearful profanations and devastations were committed in the cities of Perigueux, Lodève, Foix, La Charité, and especially at Orleans, where not a single Catholic church was left standing. In short, wherever the Calvinists had the upper hand, the sanctuaries of the Church, and conventual houses of all kinds, were sacrificed without mercy to their furious passions. No sooner was peace restored, than the bishops and clergy, zealously seconded by the faithful of all classes, applied themselves to the vast task of rebuilding these sacred edifices throughout the land. Henry IV. and his Queen laid the first stone of the new cathedral of Sainte Croix at Orleans on the 17th of April, 1601; and promised a princely contribution towards the completion of the work for ten years following. During the first decade of the century two other churches were built at Orleans; six at Paris, including those belonging to the convents of the Recollets, the Carmelites, and the Feuillans; the much-

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. vii. p. 116. *Procès-verbaux des Assembl.*, tom. i. p. 720.

admired Church of Notre-Dame de Cléry, in the Orleanois; and several founded in different parts of the country under the auspices of the Jesuits after their re-establishment in France.* These were placed in the towns where the Order had its principal houses, such as La Flèche, Moulins, Rennes, Poitiers, Amiens, and Caen. That at La Flèche is a structure of remarkable beauty.

The conversion of the sovereign to Catholicism naturally formed a prelude to a considerable movement in the same direction among the Huguenots, particularly those of the higher and better educated classes. During the reign of Henry IV. this was the principal field in which the Gallican clergy exhibited their zeal; and their success was such as to produce a marked effect upon the general tone and spirit of society with regard to religion. In connexion with this important feature of the time it will be suitable to place before the reader some account of the character and labours of Cardinal Du Perron.

Jacques Davy du Perron belonged to a family of good repute in Lower Normandy. His parents, having embraced the "new doctrine," emigrated into Switzerland to avoid molestation on account of their belief; and it was in the Canton of Berne that the future prelate and cardinal first saw the light, on the 25th of November, 1556. The earliest religious notions instilled into him were, of course, those of the Reformers; his father, a man of superior acquirements, directed his education up to the age of ten years. The lad discovered extraordinary capacity, and an insatiable love of learning. He devoted himself to study, and in the course of a few years made surprising progress in various branches of knowledge—in the classical languages, in mathematics, logic, philosophy, and natural sciences. The family returned to France on the pacification with the Huguenots in 1576; and, not long afterwards, the mind of young Du Perron became unsettled with respect to certain articles of the Calvinist creed. It is said that his doubts were first suggested by reading a treatise "On the Church," written by the well-known Duplessis-Mornay in defence of Protestantism. With characteristic zeal he at once

* Legrain, *Decade de H. le Grand*, Liv. viii. Quoted by Poirson, *Hist. du Règne de Henri IV.*, tom. iv. p. 514.

entered on an investigation of the whole controversy between Rome and Geneva. The works of the Fathers and Schoolmen — particularly those of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas — gradually opened his eyes to the hollowness of the system in which he had been nurtured; and his researches left him profoundly convinced of the truth and authority of the Catholic religion. Du Perron lost no time in abjuring the heresy of Calvin; and, having resolved to embrace the ecclesiastical profession, he received holy orders in 1577. Immediately afterwards he was appointed reader to Henry III.; and, after the assassination of that monarch, he obtained a place in the household of the Cardinal of Bourbon, whom the League dignified with the empty title of King. But in 1591 he attached himself to the cause of Henry IV.; who quickly recognized his talents, and raised him in due time to the highest stations in the Church. Du Perron now devoted his vast stores of learning, and his remarkable argumentative powers, to the work of converting the Huguenots to the true faith. His labours were richly rewarded, and he became, perhaps, the most successful agent in the great revival of religion which distinguished this epoch in France.*

In December, 1593, Du Perron sustained a controversial discussion with some Protestant ministers at Mantes, by the special permission of the king, and under conditions prescribed by him. With one of them named Rotan, a man highly esteemed by his co-religionists, he debated the question, "whether Holy Scripture is sufficient to salvation;" and we learn from L'Estoile that, after arguing for several hours, the Huguenot divine had the manliness and candour to confess himself vanquished. The next day François Becault, another eminent minister, experienced a like defeat.

Shortly after Henry's reconciliation to the Church, Du Perron, to whose influence that step was in great measure due, was nominated to the see of Evreux, in succession to Claude de Saintes. The king now despatched him as special envoy to Rome, where we have already seen him taking a principal part in the negotiations which ended in his master's recognition by the Papal Court. During his stay at Rome he was con-

* Bonav. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.*, tom. x. p. 314 et seqq.

secrated Bishop of Evreux by Cardinal de Joyeuse, Archbishop of Rouen, on the 27th December, 1595. Returning to France, he renewed his public disputations with the Calvinists—an arena in which he never failed to figure to advantage. A long list of conversions attested his prowess. Among his conquests were Pierre Palma-Cayet, author of the ‘*Chronologie Novenaire*’; Nicolas Harlai de Sancy, a confidential friend of Henry IV.; and Spondanus, or De Sponde, afterwards Bishop of Pamiers, the continuator of the *Annals of Baronius*. But it was in his famous conference with Duplessis-Mornay, in the year 1600, that the genius of Du Perron achieved its most brilliant triumph. Some detailed account of this occurrence, which at the time created an immense sensation, will doubtless be acceptable to the reader.

Duplessis-Mornay, at this time Governor of Saumur, was no less eminent for his zeal in defence of the doctrines of the Reformation than for his ability as a politician and diplomatist. His authority with his co-religionists was such that he was commonly styled “the Huguenot Pope.” He had lately published a book entitled ‘*L’Institution de l’Eucharistie*,’* in which he undertook to prove that the Calvinist view of that Sacrament is supported by the unanimous testimony of all Christian ages. It possessed considerable merit, both in point of style and learning; but the writer had unfortunately taken upon trust the quotations from the Fathers furnished to him by the Huguenot ministers, without troubling himself to verify them by personal research. These quotations were to a great extent garbled, mutilated, and perverted from their real meaning; and the result upon Mornay’s line of argument may be easily imagined. The truth was speedily detected by the orthodox divines, among others by the Bishop of Evreux. The book had been sent to him by Sully, whose party had taught him to regard it as a masterpiece; and great must have been his surprise on learning from the prelate that it was full of errors from beginning to end. “Not,” said Du Perron, “that I wish to charge M. Duplessis with intentional bad faith; but I regret that he has been so unfortunate as to rely upon the

* “De l’institution, usage, et doctrine de l’Eucharistie en l’Eglise Ancienne; ensemble quand, comment, et

par quels degrez la Messe s’est introduite en sa place.”—Salmur. MDCIV. 4to.

romances of mere compilers, who have treated him extremely ill.* Mornay, on being informed of the bishop's accusation—that the work contained at least five hundred falsified quotations—challenged him to prove this publicly; and Du Perron having signified his willingness, a request was made to the king that the question thus raised might be argued before appointed witnesses in his Majesty's presence. Henry assented, not without some malicious satisfaction at seeing his ancient comrade enter the lists with so accomplished an antagonist; and the passage of arms was fixed to take place at the Palace of Fontainebleau in the month of May, 1600. Commissioners were appointed to superintend the proceedings; the president de Thou, François Pithou the advocate, and Martin the king's reader, acting for the Catholics, and Isaac Casaubon and Canaye de Fresne, president of one of the "chambres mi-parties," for the Protestants. As the important day approached, Mornay betrayed symptoms of hesitation and shrinking from the contest. Difficulties were started as to the form, subject-matter, and extent of the controversy; but these were at length overruled, and the Conference was opened on the 4th of May in the council chamber of the palace, before the king, the Chancellor Bellièvre, the ministers of state, and a large audience of distinguished personages.† Sixty passages had been selected for examination, but, at the request of Mornay, these were reduced at the last moment to nineteen, and only nine were actually discussed. The first extract was from Joannes Scotus, on the Real Presence. Scotus, after the usual fashion of the Schoolmen, first proposes the point to be argued in the form of a question, then subjoins a negative—"videtur quod non"—on the part of a supposed opponent, and lastly proceeds to refute this fallacy and establish the truth. Mornay, from want of familiarity with this quaint mode of reasoning, mistook the negative position for the conclusion of Scotus himself; and thus attributed to him the very sentiment which it was his object to confute. It appeared that he had repeated this blunder with regard to the second passage, which was taken from Durandus. The third and fourth quotations were from

* Sully, *Economies Royales*, Liv. xi. (tom. iii. p. 37, Ed. Paris, 1822).

† See L'Estoile, *Registre-Journal de*

Henri IV., an 1600. Palma-Cayet, *Chronologie Septenaire*.

St. Chrysostom, on the invocation of saints; these were proved to have been mutilated by Mornay or his friends, by the omission of some essential words. The fifth, from St. Jerome, on the same subject, was found to be curtailed in like manner. The sixth, on the use of the sign of the cross, attributed by Mornay to St. Cyril, was not to be discovered in any part of that father's writings. The seventh was from a law of the Emperor Theodosius, which Mornay had copied correctly from a treatise by Crinitus, but it seems that the latter had misquoted it. The eighth, from St. Bernard, consisted of two passages which had been jumbled together in such a way as materially to alter the meaning. And with regard to the ninth, which was cited by Mornay from Theodoret as relating to image worship, it appeared that the historian was not speaking at all of the worship of Christians, but of the idolatry of Pagans.

At seven in the evening the king adjourned the Conference to the next day. But during the night Mornay was suddenly taken ill; De Rivière, the King's physician, found him suffering severely with vomiting, shivering, and pains in the limbs; and in the morning he declared himself incapable of resuming the disputation. The Commissioners were accordingly dismissed. On the 8th of May Mornay quitted Fontainebleau and retired to Saumur, without taking leave of the king; and this precipitate abandonment of the field was naturally interpreted as a confession of defeat. After a time, the fallen hero thought it necessary to make some movement for the purpose of covering his disgrace. With this view he published a statement under the title of '*Discours Veritable*,' in which, after making bitter complaints against the king, the Chancellor, the Commissioners, and especially against Du Perron, he proceeded to give his own version of the conference at Fontainebleau;—a version, it need hardly be said, in the highest degree favourable to himself. By way of reply, Du Perron contented himself with making public the official acts of the Conference, attested by the sign-manual of the king, and accompanied by a letter from the Chancellor. To these documents he added a brief and pungent '*Refutation du faux Discours*,' from his own pen.*

* "*Actes de la Conference entre lo Sieur évesque d'Evreux et le Sieur Duplessis en presence du Roy à Fontainebleau le 4^{me} May. 1600, publiez par permission et autorité de sa Majesté. Par Messire Jacques Davy*

In the dedication of this volume to the king, Du Perron indulges in the following somewhat caustic remarks:—"If M. du Plessis does not feel satisfied with what has passed, he has still in his hands the fifty-two remaining articles of the first day's discussion, which he carried away without taking leave of any one, and which since then he must have had abundant time to study. I am quite ready to give him the same opportunity of exercising his talents upon these, and afterwards upon the rest of the five hundred which I spoke of; and this I shall do all the more willingly, inasmuch as the authors are of more weight, the topics of more importance, and the mis-statements more outrageous."

Sully relates that, during the progress of the debate at Fontainebleau, the king turned to him, and said, "Well, what do you think now of your *Pope*?" "It seems to me, Sire," replied the Duke, "that he is more of a Pope than your Majesty supposes; for at this moment he is giving the red hat to the Bishop of Evreux."*

The fame of Du Perron received, indeed, no small additional lustre from the result of the Conference. The Pope sent him an autograph letter of congratulation in the most flattering terms. The King, writing to the Duke of Epemon, announced that "the diocese of Evreux had gained a signal victory over that of Saumur; that it was one of the greatest strokes of success that had been made by the Church for a long while; and that proceedings of this kind would effect more towards bringing back the Protestants to the Church than fifty years of war and violence." In 1604, Du Perron was promoted to the archbishopric of Sens, and appointed Grand Almoner of France; and in the same year he was elevated by Clement VIII. to the dignity of cardinal.

All circumstances considered, it is not surprising to find that the Fontainebleau Conference was followed by several notable conversions to Catholicism. Ste. Marie du Mont, one of the gentlemen of the king's chamber, was the first to give this practical testimony to Du Perron's superiority. It was he who had been the original promoter of the controversy, by directing

evêque d'Evreux, Conseiller du Roy
en son Conseil d'estat, et son premier
aumônier. Evreux, 1601."

* *Economies Royales*, Liv. xi. (tom.
iii. p. 39).

the bishop's attention to the rash challenge of Duplessis-Mornay, and entreating him to answer it. Already half-resolved to abandon Calvinism, Ste. Marie took leave of his remaining scruples in the course of the discussion; and on its conclusion forthwith re-entered the communion of the Church. Canaye de Fresne, after acting as one of the Protestant Moderators at the Conference, scandalized his party by taking a similar step shortly afterwards. Isaac Casaubon, the other commissioner on the Huguenot side, is said to have been profoundly affected by Du Perron's reasonings; but, being of a timid, hesitating disposition, he could not summon sufficient courage to act on his conviction.* Casaubon was a man of extensive learning, and one of the best classical scholars of the day. He had filled the post of Professor of Greek in the University of Montpellier. Henry IV., who valued him highly, summoned him to Paris, and made him his librarian. Casaubon had, for some time, been much dissatisfied with many of the tenets of Calvin, and with the general course of the Reformation. "I cannot conceal my disquietude," he writes to one of his friends, "at the wide divergence of our belief from that of the ancient Church. For, not to enter upon other subjects, Luther departed from the primitive doctrine as to the Sacraments; Zwingle differs from Luther; Calvin disagrees with both; and more recent teachers have abandoned Calvin. For it appears to me most certain that the doctrine of Calvin on the Eucharist is greatly at variance with that laid down in Du Moulin's treatise on that Sacrament, which is now generally taught in our churches. Hence the opponents of Du Moulin charge him with being no less adverse to the sentiments of Calvin than to those of every ancient doctor of the Church. If we continue to go on at this rate, where is it all to end?"†

But, although he had little or no faith in the principles of the Reformation, Casaubon could not make up his mind to an unqualified acceptance of the system of the Church of Rome. By way of a mezzo-termine, he resolved, after prolonged inde-

* Du Perron says that he was on the point of declaring his adhesion to the Catholic Church. "J'ay vu Monsieur Casaubon prest à prendre jour pour faire abjuration. Il avait mesme promis de traduire en Latin mon livre de

l'Eucharistie."—*Perroniana*, p. 46. Per fratres Puteanos (Dupuy), 1669.

† Casaubon to Wytenbogart (Joanni Uttenbogardo), Epist. DCLXX. Edit. Roterodam. 1709.

cision, to adopt the communion of the Church of England; and quitting France, under circumstances apparently not very creditable to his sincerity and honour, he proceeded to London. He now ingratiated himself with King James I., who gave him a prebendal stall at Canterbury, and afterwards another at Westminster. One of his sons, however, was honest enough to abjure the Reformed religion, and took the vows as a Capuchin monk. His father's words, on parting with him, were characteristic. "I give you my blessing with all my heart. I condemn you not; I beg you not to condemn me. Jesus Christ will judge us both." Casaubon died in England in 1614, and was buried in the Abbey Church of Westminster.*

Du Perron, as Cardinal, Grand Almoner, and Archbishop of Sens (which province at that time included the capital and the diocese of Paris), took a conspicuous part in the administration of affairs both in Church and State. He soon proved himself a strenuous supporter of Ultramontane doctrine, and a powerful champion of Papal interests. In the many anxious questions which were debated in his time in the Roman consistory, the opinion of Du Perron always carried extraordinary weight, and rarely failed to command the assent of the majority. Such, indeed, was the fascination of his eloquence, that Pope Paul V. was accustomed to say to the cardinals around him, "Let us all pray God to inspire Cardinal Du Perron; for he will make us believe whatever he pleases."

Amid the seductions of general admiration and brilliant success, this great prelate seems to have preserved much simplicity and modesty of character. He was ever ready to acknowledge to their full extent the gifts and powers of others, and to depreciate his own in comparison. "To *convince* is but a small thing," he was wont to say; "to *convert* is the grand difficulty.

* The following is the inscription on the mural tablet erected to him in the South transept of the abbey:—

ISAAC' CASAUBON'.

O doctiorum quicquid est assurgite
Huic tam colendo nomini.
Quem Gallia Reip. literariæ bono peperit.
Henricus IV. Francorum Rex invictissimus
Lutetium literis suis evocatum bibliothecæ suæ
præfexit.
Charumque deinceps dum vixit habuit.
Eoque terris erepto Jacobus Mag. Brit. monarcha
Regum doctissimus doctis indulgentiss. in An-
gliam accivit.

Munificè fovit. Posteritasque ob doctrinam
aeternum mirabitur.

H. S. E. invidiâ major.

Obiit ætern. in Xto. vitam anhelans

Kal. IVL. MDCLIV. æt. LV.

Viro opt. immortalitate digniss.

Th. Mortonus Ep. Dunelm.

Jucundissimæ, quoad frui licuit, consuetudinis
memor.

pr. s. p. cv.

MDCLXXIV.

Qui nosse vult Casaubonum

Nen saxa sed chartas legat

Superfuturas marmoris

Et profuturas posteris.

I may be able to silence heretics, but the man to convert them is François de Sales.”* The celebrated person here named (to whose history the reader’s attention will be called hereafter) was at this time beginning to attract notice and interest in France. François de Sales, then coadjutor to the Bishop of Geneva, preached the course of Lent sermons in the chapel of the Louvre in the year 1602, and produced a marvellous impression, not only on Henry IV. and his family, but on the Huguenot nobility, who flocked in crowds to hear him; several of them are said to have been converted in consequence.

The Gallican Church possessed at this period, besides Du Perron, six other prelates who had attained the rank of cardinal. These were—(1.) François de Joyeuse, Archbishop of Narbonne, afterwards of Toulouse, and finally of Rouen. De Joyeuse was raised to the purple by Gregory XIII. in 1583. The greater part of his life was passed in diplomatic employments. For several years he was agent for the Duke of Mayenne and the League at the Court of Rome; but on the conversion of Henry IV. he at once declared in his favour, and exerted all his influence to procure his absolution at the hands of Clement VIII. Perhaps the most important transaction in which this cardinal figured was the reconciliation effected by his means between the Venetian States and the Church, after the rash interdict inflicted on the Republic by Paul V. De Joyeuse enjoyed a high place in the confidence of Henry IV., and was named by him a member of the Council of Regency in 1610, in the prospect of his setting out to join the army a few days before his assassination. The Cardinal died in 1615.

(2.) Arnaud d’Ossat was a remarkable instance of elevation, by the force of personal merit, from obscurity and poverty to the highest posts of dignity and honour. His father was a blacksmith in a small hamlet of Languedoc. Both his parents died while he was a mere child, and he was left friendless and destitute in the world. A charitable gentleman in the neighbourhood took pity on him, and had him educated as a companion to his nephew. His powers of mind rapidly developed, and he prosecuted his studies with unremitting energy and

* *Vie de S. François de Sales*, par le Curé de S. Sulpice (M. Hamon), tom. i. liv. iii. p. 396.

surprising success. For some time he practised as a barrister, but abandoned that profession on being appointed secretary to the French ambassador at Rome, and from that time forth he was identified with the diplomatic intercourse between France and the Holy See. Upon the death of the ambassador De Foix, D'Ossat succeeded to the post of chargé d'affaires at Rome, and in that capacity conducted the intricate ecclesiastical negotiations of the earlier part of the reign of Henry IV. His services in the affair of the King's reconciliation with the Pope were rewarded with the bishopric of Rennes, from which he was afterwards translated to Bayeux. D'Ossat was created a Cardinal in 1598, and continued to reside chiefly at Rome as the official representative of his sovereign until his death, which happened in 1604.

(3.) François d'Escoubleau de Sourdis was the eldest son of a noble family; and, had he pursued the walk of life for which he was originally destined, would doubtless have risen to high rank at court and in the army. But his impressions of religion were so deep and strong that he found it no difficult task to forego his brilliant prospects in the world. Having taken orders, he devoted himself energetically to the work of the ministry, and acquired a distinguished reputation in the south of France. Clement VIII., at the personal solicitation of Henry IV., gave him a cardinal's hat in 1598, and he was named to the archbishopric of Bordeaux in the same year. Cardinal de Sourdis administered his diocese with exemplary zeal, vigour, and piety; insomuch that he was commonly called the "French Borromeo." He laboured earnestly, and with considerable success, to restore discipline, and raise the standard of professional exertion, among his clergy; and a provincial Council which he held at Bordeaux in 1624 is an event of no small importance in the ecclesiastical annals of the time. This admirable prelate died in 1628, and was succeeded as archbishop by his brother, Henri de Sourdis;—a man of ability, but of a disposition more ambitious and warlike than became his profession. He acted as second in command to Cardinal Richelieu at the famous siege of La Rochelle.

(4.) Pierre de Gondi, a member of the great Florentine family of that name, was consecrated Bishop of Langres in 1566, and translated to Paris two years afterwards. He was

a prelate of high merit, and conducted himself with singular moderation and discretion during the troubles of the League. Pope Sixtus V. made him a cardinal in 1587. Some years afterwards he resigned the bishopric of Paris in favour of his nephew, Henri de Gondi. He died in 1616. The see of Paris, it should be noticed, was occupied successively by *four* prelates of the Gondi family. The first was Pierre de Gondi, above mentioned; the second, his nephew Henri, son of the first Duc de Retz, and a favourite counsellor of Louis XIII. The third, Jean François de Gondi, brother of the preceding, was the first *Archbishop* of Paris; the see having been detached from the province of Sens, and raised to metropolitical rank, by Gregory XV. in 1622. The fourth, Jean François Paul, son of Philippe Comte de Joigny, was the celebrated Cardinal de Retz, the demagogue of the Fronde; a man whose name is associated in history with pursuits and qualities the most diametrically opposite to those of the ecclesiastical profession. He became Archbishop of Paris on the death of his uncle in 1654.

(5.) Anne Escars de Givri, Bishop of Lisieux, and afterwards of Metz, had been a zealous member of the Catholic League; and as such, his elevation to the Cardinalate in 1596 was by no means acceptable to Henry IV. Appreciating, however, the prelate's many excellent qualities, Henry treated him with favour and confidence, and advanced him to the see of Metz. Cardinal de Givri died in 1612.

(6.) Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, was the son of Charles, Duke of Lorraine, by the Princess Claude, daughter of King Henry II. He was Bishop of Metz, and subsequently of Strasburg, and was created cardinal by Sixtus V. in 1589. He died at an early age in 1607.

The general spirit of Henry's policy in the earlier part of his reign was, naturally and pre-eminently, that of conciliation. The Edict of Nantes was one movement of vast importance in this direction. It was closely followed by another of scarcely less moment, but prompted by very different considerations, and tending towards almost opposite results, namely, the recall of the banished Jesuits to France.

On the 29th of December, 1594, at a moment when the

popular mind was violently exasperated by the attempt of Jean Châtel to assassinate the king on his return from Amiens, the Parliament of Paris had published an arrêt by which all members of the "so-called Society of Jesus" were expelled from the kingdom, "as corrupters of youth, disturbers of the public peace, and enemies to the King and the State." The property of the Order was confiscated; Jean Châtel's house was levelled with the ground; and an obelisk was raised on the spot, with an inscription which recorded that his crime was dictated by "that pestilent sect of heretics, who, masking under the garb of piety the most atrocious wickedness, had of late publicly maintained that it was lawful to take the life of the king." The sentence of banishment was executed only within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Paris.* In other parts of France—in Languedoc, Gascony, and Lorraine—the residence of the Jesuits was connived at, and their educational labours were not interrupted. No sooner had the king reconciled himself with the Holy See, than representations reached him from many quarters in behalf of the proscribed followers of Loyola. Cardinal de Medicis, the Pope's legate, assured him, in the name of the Holy Father, that he could not do a greater service to the Church than by taking measures for their restoration, and reminded him that he had made a promise to that effect on the occasion of his absolution. Apology after apology was put forth by members and friends of the Order, elaborately defending it from the imputations of regicide and revolutionary doctrine, and indignantly repudiating all complicity with the traitorous deed of Châtel. The popular persuasion, that the Jesuits were intimately leagued with the enemies of France, and were unscrupulous agents of Philip of Spain, was combated with vehement earnestness. At length, on the 1st of January, 1600, the project of re-establishment was mooted in the royal Council; the king, however, acted with caution, and, finding that several of the ministers were adverse to it, postponed the matter for further consideration.

Three years later it was resumed, and this time with practical effect. Just at that moment, the French Protestants held a

* The "ressort" of the Parliament of Paris included more than 150 inferior tribunals—"presidiaux," "bailliages," "sénéchaussées," "chatellenies,"

&c., distributed in various provinces,—the Isle de France, Orleanois, Maine, Touraine, Anjou, Berry, Nivernois, Champagne, and Picardy.

general Synod at Gap in Dauphiné; and here, among other extravagant proceedings, they added to their Confession a new article of faith, affirming the Pope to be Antichrist—the “son of perdition” predicted by St. Paul—the “beast” of Daniel and of the Apocalypse. It appears that they adopted this offensive dogma because it was thought necessary to support one of their pastors named Ferrier, who had lately maintained the same sentiment, and had encouraged his brethren in holding like intemperate language. The good sense of Sully revolted against this strange piece of synodical legislation. He remonstrated with some of the leading ministers; and his arguments, accompanied by an intimation of the King’s serious displeasure, procured at length the suppression of the article in question. The Pope, however, was so vehement in his indignation, that Henry found considerable difficulty in appeasing him; and, according to Sully’s account, it was chiefly with a view to give his Holiness satisfaction for the offence that he now finally determined on re-establishing the Jesuits.*

During a visit which the king made to Metz, in March, 1603, certain of the Jesuit fathers were received by him at a private audience, being introduced by the Duke of Epemon and a favourite courtier named Fouquet de la Varenne.† The Provincial, Ignace Armand, took care to improve the opportunity, and succeeded in obtaining from his Majesty an assurance that they would not have long to wait for decisive measures in their favour. On his return to the capital, Henry assembled the Council of State, and laid before them his design for re-instating the Society of Jesus. The members present were the Constable Montmorency, the Chancellor Bellièvre, the Secretary of State Villeroi, Sully, Chateauneuf, Pontcarré, and the presidents of the Parliament Sillery, De Vic, Calignon, Caumartin, Jeannin, and De Thou. The majority of these were favourably disposed towards the Jesuits; and as it was understood that the monarch’s mind was already made up on the subject, little or no discussion took place.

* *Economies Royales*, Liv. xvi.

† “Le plus puissant solliciteur des Jesuites était Guillaume Fouquet de la Varenne, qui, des plus bas offices de la maison du Roi, s’était élevé jusque dans le cabinet par ses complaisances et par les ministères de volupté qui sont les

plus agréables auprès des grands. Ce favori était Lieutenant-Général de la province d’Anjou, Gouverneur de La Flèche, Abbé d’Ainay de Lyon, &c.”—Bonav. Racine, *Abreg. de l’Hist. Eccles.* tom. x. p. 164.

The only objector was De Thou, who proposed that the case should be referred to the Parliament, and that its decision should be final. The veteran Sully avoided giving his opinion at the Council board; but the next day he sought an interview with Henry, and candidly expressed his sense of the inexpediency and danger of the proposed scheme. His arguments were strongly flavoured, as was natural, by his religious prejudices; but they displayed at the same time remarkable sagacity and foresight. He urged that the Jesuits, adepts as they were notoriously in all the arts of intrigue, would not fail to stir up bitterness and animosity between his Majesty's subjects of the two rival communions; that, if restored unconditionally, they would make such use of the various expedients at their command, in private familiar intercourse, in the pulpit, and, above all, in the confessional, as would array class against class in open enmity, and sooner or later precipitate the kingdom once more into civil war. He feared, moreover, that they would completely gain the ear, and perhaps the heart, of the monarch himself; and would exercise their influence by excluding from, and admitting to, his presence and councils whatever individuals they pleased. He reminded him, again, of the absolute subserviency of the Jesuits to their General and to the Pope; the former of whom was always a Spaniard, while the latter was dependent upon the King of Spain for the security of his Italian possessions. Lastly, he appealed to Henry's personal experience of their ill-will, and pointed out that it was their interest to place another prince upon the throne, in whom they might hope to find a more passive instrument of their own purposes.

Some of these anticipations have almost a prophetic air, when we regard them in connection with certain passages in the subsequent history of the Jesuits in France.

Henry, in reply, told Sully that, as he was now situated, he must of necessity do one of two things; either completely reinstate the Jesuits, or expel them from France more rigorously than ever. In the latter case they would be driven to extremities, and would inevitably embark in desperate conspiracies against his life; and, in spite of all precautions, they might one day succeed in their design. This, it appears, was a risk which even the chivalrous Henry had no mind to incur if he could avoid

it.* The force of such a consideration was, of course, irresistible. Sully remained silent; and the king proceeded to give effect to his determination.

The ordonnance recalling the Jesuits was signed at Rouen in September, 1603; but on being presented to the Parliament of Paris for registration, it met with a warm and obstinate resistance. The magistrates proceeded in a body to the Louvre, headed by their first president, Achille de Harlai; who, in a speech full of energetic eloquence, laboured to dissuade the sovereign from a step so pregnant with disaster both to the royal person and to the State. "His harangue," says Dupleix,† "was an outrageous philippic, crammed with all the abuse which had been heaped on the Society in the pleadings of Pasquier and Arnauld, the Catechism of the said Pasquier, and by the author of the *Franc-advis*, rather than a fair and reasonable remonstrance." It was, however, a performance of considerable talent. De Harlai adverted to the strong opposition which had been raised by the Sorbonne and by the clergy of all ranks to the original introduction of the Jesuits into France. The Sorbonne had warned the Government of that day that if this step were taken, it would not be for edification but for destruction. He enlarged on the dangerous character of an order of men claiming to be exempt from all jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, except that of the Pope; and holding, as a fundamental maxim, that the Pope may excommunicate kings, and that an excommunicated king is no better than a tyrant, so that all men may lawfully rise against him. He intimated to the king that his predecessors, even those who were most disposed to govern absolutely, had always been accustomed to regulate affairs connected with public justice by the advice of their Parliament, and to submit their own inclinations to the authority of the laws. "We entreat you, Sire," he concluded, "to uphold these powers which have always been legally vested in your Parliamentary Courts. If they should unhappily be lost, pardon us for observing that the loss would fall, not upon the Parliament, but upon yourself."

* "Le roi répondit en particulier à ses amis et aux gens du Parlement, qui lui parlaient contre les Jesuites, *Assurez-moi de ma vie*. Ce monarque si intrépide avoit perdu la crainte de

toutes choses, hormis du couteau Jesuitique."—D'Aubigné, *Hist. Universelle*, Part II.

† Scipion Dupleix, *Hist. de France, Henri IV.*, p. 346. Paris, 1633.

The friends of the Jesuits were somewhat apprehensive that Henry might not be able to reply off-hand to the studied and dignified address of the Chief Magistrate.* He acquitted himself, however, with an ease, force, and mastery both of argument and language, which far surpassed their expectations. De Thou, and other writers hostile to the Order, contest the authenticity of the speech commonly attributed to his Majesty on this occasion; but there are no sufficient grounds for questioning it. It is given at length by the contemporary historian Pierre Matthieu, who is known to have been furnished with materials for his work by the king himself; and all the evidence derivable from its style and phraseology is strongly in favour of its genuineness.†

Henry assured them that the difficulties which they had started were only such as he himself had fully considered during many years past; and hinted that, in taking cognizance of state affairs of that description, they had travelled beyond their legitimate sphere. With regard to the Colloquy of Poissy (on which occasion the Society had first succeeded in establishing itself in France), he observed that things would have gone better for the Catholics if all had played their part with the same ability as was displayed by a certain Jesuit (Lainez), who fortunately happened to be there. "Ignorance," he continued, "has been in all ages the malicious enemy of knowledge; and I have remarked that ever since I first began to speak of restoring the Jesuits, two classes of men have been foremost in opposing it,—those who belong to the pretended Reformed religion, and ecclesiastics of disreputable lives; and this has served to make them all the more entitled to esteem. If the Sorbonne formerly condemned them, this was done, after your own example at present, without knowing much about them; I believe that the existing Theological Faculty estimates them very highly. The University opposed them, because they teach

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 27. The work of this learned Jesuit commences with the seventeenth century. The great ability with which it is executed, and the amount of estimation generally accorded to it, justify me in referring to it throughout the period which it embraces. I believe D'Avrigny to be upon the whole an accurate, trustworthy writer; nevertheless, when we consider the critical circumstances of

those times, and the grave party interests involved in the controversies then prevailing, it is necessary to make a certain allowance for prepossessions and tendencies from which he could not possibly have been altogether exempt.

† See also the *Lettres Missives de Henri IV.*, published by authority of the French Government, tom. vi. p. 182, and Schœll, *Cours d'Histoire des Etats Européens*, tom. xvii.

better than others; this is the real reason why the University is deserted, as you complain, since their expulsion, and why students flock after them to Douai and other places, both within and beyond the kingdom. You say, again, that the Jesuits attract superior minds, and choose their members from among the best of men. I commend them for so doing. I desire that the best men we can procure should be chosen to serve as soldiers, and that none but those who deserve it shall be admitted to seats on the judicial bench; I wish that in all professions virtue and merit should be the main distinctions between man and man. It is objected that they gain entrance into cities and towns by whatever means they can; so do others. I myself was obliged to find my way to the throne as best I might. But it must be allowed that through their perseverance and steadiness of conduct the Jesuits succeed in accomplishing whatever they undertake; and their scrupulous care to maintain their original constitution without change will ensure to them a long existence.

“It is alleged that the King of Spain avails himself of their services. I, for my part, declare that I mean to do the same; for why should France be in a less advantageous position in this respect than Spain? I consider the Jesuits needful to my empire; they are native Frenchmen, and owe me allegiance as their sovereign. I do not wish to be on bad terms with any class of my natural born subjects; and if there should be any danger of their betraying my secrets to my enemies, be sure that I shall not communicate to them anything more than I think proper. Be so good as to allow me to manage this affair; I have settled many others far more difficult; do not trouble yourselves further in the business than to obey my orders.”

Notwithstanding the king's peremptory tone, the Parliament still demurred, and attempted to interpose modifications before they consented to register the ordonnance. Henry rejected their suggestions, and insisted on unqualified and speedy compliance. The Parliament at length registered the edict on the 2nd of January, 1604, and the Jesuits resumed their legal position in France.

Several conditions, however, were appended to this act of grace. The edict specified the localities in which the Order was authorized to possess colleges: namely, Toulouse, Auch, Bordeaux, Rodez, Limoges, Périgueux, Aubenas, Tournon, Béziers,

and Le Puy; to these were now added three others, Lyons, Dijon, and La Flèche. In no other place was their residence to be fixed without the king's express permission. They were all to be native Frenchmen, and were to take an oath before the royal officers, "without mental reservation," that they would never attempt anything to the prejudice of the king or against the tranquillity of the State. They were to be incapable of acquiring real property by purchase, gift, or otherwise, without the king's permission; nor could they succeed to any inheritance either direct or collateral. They were never to infringe the rights and privileges of bishops, of civil corporations, of the Universities, or of religious orders. They were not to preach, administer the Sacraments, or hear confessions, beyond the walls of their own establishments, unless by licence from the ordinary. And lastly, one member of their body was to reside constantly at Court, in the quality of preacher, to be answerable to the king for the good conduct of his brethren.* Any infraction of these articles was to be punished by the revocation of the present edict.

The individual selected by the king to remain near his person in the capacity of hostage for the good behaviour of the rest of the fraternity was Pierre Coton or Cotton, a native of Nerondes in the Forez, where he was born in 1564. At the age of twenty he entered the Jesuit college at Arona in Piedmont; and after completing his noviciate, he studied theology with singular zeal first at Milan and afterwards at Rome. Having given proof of distinguished oratorical talent, Coton was sent by his superiors to Lyons, where he acquired a first-rate reputation as a preacher. He was soon employed on missions, and engaged in polemical discussions with the Huguenots throughout the southern provinces. His success was almost unexampled. At Nismes, in September, 1600, he held a debate with the Protestant minister Chamier, who had charged him with falsifying quotations in a treatise which he had published on the Eucharistic sacrifice; hoping thus to turn the tables on the Catholics for the humiliation which had just been inflicted on Duplessis-Mornay. Judges having been appointed on both sides, the question was publicly argued in the presence of

* See the Edict in Isambert, *Anciennes Loix Françaises*, tom. xv. p. 288.

Cardinal de Sourdis, the Bishop of Nismes, and a large audience. Coton cleared himself triumphantly from the charge of misquotation, and defended his doctrine with so much spirit, learning, readiness of resource, and force of reasoning, as to produce a marked impression. The president Canaye de Fresne arrived from Paris during the progress of the discussion, and interposed his influence to bring it to a close, which was done accordingly. That conscientious magistrate, whose judgment was already substantially convinced by the logic of Du Perron at Fontainebleau, made his public recantation of Calvinism a few months afterwards. Thirty-five Protestants of Nismes followed his example.

The talents of Father Coton were well known to Henry IV. through the good offices of Lesdiguières, who admired him warmly; and from the first moment of his introduction at Court the King seems to have conceived for him feelings of extraordinary regard. A vacancy occurring just then in the Archbishopric of Arles, Henry offered the preferment to his new favourite, and was surprised when he declined it, on the ground that the rules of his Order forbade him to accept any ecclesiastical dignity. Such a proof of disinterestedness is said to have raised the Jesuits still higher in the royal esteem; and it was not long before Coton was installed in the deeply responsible office of the king's confessor.*

This was the commencement of the prodigious empire which was exercised by the Jesuits over the entire fabric of society in France during the seventeenth century, and in the first half of the eighteenth. Having once gained the prestige of this confidential relationship with royalty, they monopolised the position with a long series of the most skilful directors that the Institute could furnish; and however reprehensible their policy may have been in certain instances, there cannot be a clearer proof of the superlative ability with which the Order was governed in the earlier part of its career. The obligation to have one of their number in constant residence at Court, imposed originally as a mark of distrust and a means of control, was thus converted by

* The sudden ascendancy of F. Coton over Henry occasioned various specimens of epigrammatic wit. The following indicates the popular suspicion that the new confessor was an agent or

confederate of the enemies of France:—

“Autant que le roi fait de pas
Le Père Coton l'accompagne;
Mais ce bon roi ne songe pas
Que le fin Coton vient d'Espagne.”

their adroitness into an instrument of moral domination almost without example.

One of the first points carried by Father Coton after assuming his new character was the demolition of the obelisk on the site of Jean Châtel's house, which mutely, yet eloquently, denounced the Order as the instigators of his crime. It was removed in July, 1605, and the measure provoked no small amount of sarcastic merriment among the Parisians. In one pamphlet the obelisk was personified, and made to declare that after all its fate was not to be regretted, since, though first erected as an act of justice, its destruction was prompted by clemency and compassion.* Another suggested that in order to obliterate all trace of the condoned offence, the king ought to replace the *tooth* which had been dashed from his mouth by the blow of Châtel's dagger.

The chateau of La Flèche, in Anjou, was now bestowed, as a token of distinguished favour, on the Jesuits, and became a collegiate seminary under their direction. The King endowed the institution with princely generosity. The most accomplished members of the Order in France,—among them Fathers Pétau, Caussin, Cellot, Mambrun, Vavas seur—were appointed to the professorial chairs; and in the course of a few years La Flèche attained the highest reputation, and was thronged with students from all parts of the kingdom. Réne Descartes, afterwards the renowned philosopher, was one of the first pupils admitted within its walls.

Similar establishments on a smaller scale were founded under royal patronage at Bourges, Poitiers, Amiens, Moulins, and elsewhere; and in 1608 the Jesuits received permission to open a house in the metropolis. In the same year the king thought proper to dispense with the regulation which required all Jesuits domiciled in France to be native-born Frenchmen. Foreign members of the Order were thenceforth to share all the privileges enjoyed by their brethren under the late edict. It was not, however, till several years later that they obtained licence to give public lectures at Paris; nor were they even then admitted to the corporate body of the University.

In the transactions which we have been reviewing, as well as

* 'La Prosopopée de la Pyramide.' See Dulaure, *Histoire de Paris*, tom. v.

in other ecclesiastical affairs of the highest moment, Henry IV. is known to have been guided by the counsels of an illustrious prelate, whose character and ministry left so deep a mark on the religious society of his age, that some account of him is indispensable to our narrative.

FRANÇOIS DE SALES cannot be claimed, in strict accuracy, as a member of the Gallican Church. He was, however, intimately connected with France by education and early association; he maintained a close intercourse with that country throughout life; and in several important passages of his history he acted with the national bishops and clergy rather as one of their own body than as a foreigner.

Sprung from one of the most ancient and distinguished houses of Savoy, François de Sales inherited worldly prospects attractive in no common degree. From his boyhood, however, he discovered a decided vocation for the sacred ministry; and disdaining in comparison the gifts of fortune, the allurements of pleasure, and the advantages of high social position, he devoted himself with full purpose of heart to that laborious career. He received the tonsure at the age of eleven; and after some elementary instruction at the college of Annécý, he was sent to pursue his studies at Paris under the care of the Jesuits. Here his preceptors were the famous Génébrard, and Maldonatus (Maldonat), author of the well-known Commentary on the Gospels.* Under such tuition his taste for ecclesiastical learning and for a religious life rose to intense enthusiasm. It was to no purpose that his father procured for him a lucrative appointment connected with the Parliament at Chambéry, which would have opened an almost certain path to distinction in the legal profession. François modestly, but steadily, declined it, and remained fixed in his early determination. At length his father consented to his wishes, though not without considerable reluctance; and in 1592 he was ordained deacon, and appointed prévôt of the cathedral church of Annécý† by Claude de Granier, titular Bishop of Geneva. François de Sales at once threw himself with all the energies of his impassioned nature

* Marsollier, *Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, tom. i. p. 26.

† The office of prévôt answers nearly to that of dean. The episcopal See had

been transferred to Annécý in 1534, when Calvinism became dominant at Geneva.

into the duties of the pastoral care; in which his zeal and ability became so conspicuous, that as soon as he was admitted to priests' orders, his diocesan entrusted him with an enterprise requiring the very highest ministerial qualifications, and involving no small share of personal danger. This was a mission for re-establishing the Catholic religion in the province of Chablais, and in the bailliages of Gex, Ternier, and Gaillard, where it had been almost totally suppressed by the Zwinglian Reformation fifty years before. Accompanied by only one colleague,* a kinsman of like spirit, François undertook without hesitation this hazardous task, in spite of the tears, intreaties, and remonstrances of his nearest relatives. The inhabitants of the Chablais were a rude, ferocious race, and of that fanatical type in religion which Calvinism usually engenders. The two missionaries met with a reception which might have daunted the bravest heart. During the whole of the first year they endured a bitter persecution. Coarse abuse, reckless calumny, cowardly insults, deadly menaces, were their daily portion: oftentimes their lives were in imminent peril, and they were forced to fly from "the madness of the people" into the recesses of the forests.† These trials they supported with heroic fortitude. The grossest outrage never overcame their gentleness of temper; the severest hardships were never allowed to interrupt the progress of their labours. At last the tide turned. The first symptom of the change was a remarkable reformation among the licentious soldiery of the garrison of Thonon, the capital of the district; and such a phenomenon in such a quarter made an immediate impression on the town and neighbourhood.‡ The impulse, once given, proved irresistible. This practical specimen of the effect of Catholic teaching was a triumphant answer to the falsehoods so industriously propagated by the Calvinists; the prejudices of the multitude began to abate; the instructions of François and his companion, so long scorned, were sought with avidity, and received with admiring gratitude. Never was reaction more

* His cousin Louis de Sales, one of the canons of Annécy.

† *Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, par le curé de St. Sulpice (M. Hamon), tom. i. Liv. ii. p. 153.

‡ Another event which contributed much to the advancement of the Catholic

cause was the conversion of the Baron d'Avully, a nobleman of high character and great influence in those parts, who had hitherto been a determined supporter of Protestantism.—*Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, par le curé de St. Sulpice, tom. i. Liv. ii. p. 179.

complete. Day after day fresh conversions were announced, to the great discomfiture of the Protestant ministers; and the flock thus happily regained by the Church became ere long powerful enough to effect the restoration of Catholic worship in the principal church of Thonon. The details of the movement read like the records of a miraculous age. Six hundred individuals are said to have yielded to the matchless eloquence and pathos of a single discourse of François de Sales. Some of his biographers estimate at *seventy-two thousand* the number of those who were reclaimed from Zwinglian and Calvinistic error during his mission in the Chablais.*

In less than four years from the commencement of the undertaking, François de Sales had the satisfaction of seeing Catholicism fully re-instated, and its ordinances universally frequented, throughout the district which had been the scene of his labours. His success drew forth warm congratulations from his sovereign the Duke of Savoy, from the aged Bishop of Geneva, and from Cardinal de Medici, Papal legate at the court of France. Bishop Granier shortly afterwards named him coadjutor in the diocese of Geneva, with the right of succession on the occurrence of a vacancy. Accepting the charge, though with hesitation and unfeigned diffidence, De Sales now proceeded to Rome, where he was received with distinguished honour by the reigning Pontiff, Clement VIII. Seated in the midst of a crowded consistory, the Pope caused the bishop-designate to be examined in his presence upon various points of controversial and casuistical divinity; the object being (as it appears) to give him an opportunity of displaying his unrivalled powers and acquirements before this august assembly.† The examination was conducted chiefly by Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius, but occasionally by the Holy Father himself. When it was finished, the Pope embraced him, hailed him as the “Apostle of the Chablais,” and addressed to him the words of the royal Preacher, “Bibe, fili mi, aquam de cisternâ tuâ, et

* Marsollier, *Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, tom. i. p. 66.

† Among the subjects on which he was questioned were the following: (1) The formal cause of the blessedness of the saints. (2) Whether bishops have power to absolve from the spiritual dis-

abilities resulting from *hidden sin*. With regard to the latter point, the Pope himself ruled it in the negative; upon which François at once expressed his filial submission to the will of his Holiness.—*Vie, &c.*, par le curé de S. Sulpice, tom. i., Liv. iii. p. 344.

fluenta putei tui; deriventur fontes tui foras, et in plateis aquas tuas divide." (Prov. v. 15, 16.) He was immediately preconised coadjutor to the Bishop of Geneva, with the title of Bishop of Nicopolis *in partibus*.

Early in the following year François de Sales was summoned to the French metropolis, to negociate with Henry and his ministers in favour of a portion of the flock entrusted to him, who had recently been transferred by the fortune of war from Savoy to the dominion of France. By the treaty of Lyons, concluded between Henry IV. and Charles Emanuel of Savoy in January, 1601, the "Pays de Gex" was ceded, or rather restored, to France, together with the adjoining districts. The bailliage of Gex contained thirty-seven parishes, and about thirty thousand inhabitants, of whom the great majority were Calvinists. On behalf of the Catholic minority, the bishop-coadjutor petitioned, 1st, that the Catholic religion might be freely exercised in all places within the bailliage where it had prevailed before the religious troubles; and 2ndly, that the Church property which had been illegally seized in the so-called Reformation should be restored to the Catholic clergy and conventual houses. These were points upon which it was not easy to obtain satisfaction from the French Government. The Secretary Villeroi hesitated, temporized, procrastinated; and François de Sales found himself unavoidably detained at Paris for many months. His sojourn there was memorable for results of deep importance to the welfare of the Gallican Church.

The course of Lent sermons in the Chapel of the Louvre, for the year 1602, was preached, as already noticed, by the coadjutor of Geneva; and several interesting cases of conversion are recorded to have followed among Calvinists of the upper classes. The king treated him from the first with extreme reverence and admiration, and often consulted him upon matters of the most private nature affecting his conscience. Nor was the bishop chargeable with aught of that unworthy complaisance which is so great a snare to courtly ecclesiastics under like circumstances. His Majesty left it distinctly on record, that "M. de Genève never flattered him." No man could be better qualified, by the rare combination of fervent devotion and spirituality of mind with great practical sagacity and energy, to take the lead in works of Church reformation and Christian

beneficence. Applications now arrived from all quarters for his advice and co-operation. Every new undertaking was submitted to him for approval; no gathering for any purpose connected with the work of the Church was reckoned complete without his presence; his services as a spiritual guide were sought with the utmost eagerness in every grade of society. Nothing was talked of in Paris but the virtues of the coadjutor of Geneva;—his gentleness, his tenderness, his patience, his charity, his disinterestedness, his never-failing serenity and equanimity of temper.

Henry IV. repeatedly attempted to induce François de Sales to take up his abode permanently in France. "Remain with me, M. de Genève," said the monarch; "I will obtain for you richer preferment, more desirable employments, than any which the Duke of Savoy has to dispose of." But the good bishop's ambition did not lie in this direction. He explained to Henry that he was not at liberty to form any fresh ecclesiastical connexion; he was already united to a spouse who commanded all his interest, care, and affection; and he could not be so ungenerous as to abandon her because she was poor.* He quitted Paris on his return to his diocese in the autumn of 1602; and during the journey received tidings of the death of Bishop Granier, and of his own succession to the see. On the 8th of December, 1602, he was consecrated Bishop of Geneva by the Archbishop of Vienne, Metropolitan of the province.

Among other results traceable to the influence of this gifted prelate may be mentioned the establishment in France of the order of Carmelite nuns of the reform of St. Theresa of Spain. In our own days of sober, undemonstrative, rational religion, it is not easy to comprehend the eagerness of French Catholics in the seventeenth century to introduce into the kingdom this extreme type of cloistered asceticism. The highest and noblest in the land were ardently engaged in the scheme. Princesses of the blood-royal were among its chief promoters. Catherine, Antoinette, and Marguerite, daughters of the Duke of Longueville by Marie de Bourbon, Duchess of Estouteville, though nurtured amid the luxuries and fascinations of a court, were models of devout piety and active charity. Two of them had

* *Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, par le curé de S. Sulpice, tom. i. Liv. iii. p. 407.

formed at an early age the resolution to lead a single life; the third, Antoinette, was married to Charles de Gondi, Marquis of Belleisle; but, upon his death, she renounced the world for the cloister, and took the veil in the Feuillantine convent at Toulouse. These three princesses were naturally looked up to as the patronesses of every new design for the advancement of Catholicism in France;—a distinction which they shared, however, with many other personages of exalted station,—their sister-in-law Catherine de Gonzague, Duchess of Longueville,* Anne de Caumont, Countess of St. Pol, Catherine of Lorraine, Duchess of Nevers, the Duchess of Mercœur, Madame de Magnelais, and others, whose names will occur in our subsequent pages. But the person who became the most direct instrument in the adoption of the reformed Carmelite rule in France was Barbara d'Avrillot, wife of Pierre Acarie de Villemor, one of the *maîtres des comptes* at Paris. Nature had endowed this lady with extraordinary energy and force of character; and she exhibited from her youth upwards a pattern of every domestic and social virtue. During the convulsions of the League it was her lot to endure trials and privations of no common severity; and it was mainly owing to her admirable management—her prudence, activity, and courage—that her husband and family were saved from utter ruin. Madame Acarie enjoyed the highest consideration in the religious society of Paris. She was consulted like an oracle, and was believed by her friends to enjoy the privilege of special communications from above. Under her auspices the introduction of the Carmelites was now discussed in frequent conferences, the three princesses of Longueville being constant attendants at these meetings, together with François de Sales, the Abbé (afterwards Cardinal) de Bérulle, M. de Marillac, and André Duval, an eminent doctor of the Sorbonne.† Upon their solicitation the necessary letters patent were granted by the Crown; but it was found a matter of great difficulty to obtain the services of some professed sisters of the

* Widow of Henry of Orleans Duke of Longueville. In gratitude for the recovery of her son after a dangerous accident, she founded in 1617 a second Carmelite convent in the Rue Chapon, which she liberally endowed. The young duke afterwards married Anne

Généviève de Bourbon, who was the celebrated Duchess of Longueville of the Fronde.

† Duval wrote a biography of Madame Acarie: *La Vie de Sœur Marie de l'Incarnation*, par le P. Duval. Paris, 1621.

order from Spain, whose presence was deemed essential to the foundation of the institution at Paris. The obstacle was at length surmounted through the self-denying exertions of the Abbé de Bérulle, who made a journey to Spain for the purpose; no trifling undertaking in those days. In October, 1604, six Carmelite nuns arrived at Paris, and were installed in a conventual building which had been prepared for them in the Faubourg S. Jacques; the ancient priory of Notre Dame des Champs, a dependency of the great Abbey of Marmoutier. Shortly afterwards Queen Marie de Medicis visited the convent in state, with the princesses and a brilliant train; on which occasion seven ladies, who had been carefully disciplined in all the usages of the rule under the superintendence of Madame Acarie, made their profession, and assumed the habit of the Order. One of them was Charlotte, Marquise de Breauté, daughter of De Harlai de Sanci, one of the favourite ministers of Henry IV.* It was not long before this example was followed by other devout women of the higher ranks;—the three daughters of Madame Acarie, a daughter of the Duc de Brissac, Madame de Chandénier, sister of Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, and Madame de Bérulle, daughter of the President de Séguier, and mother of the future Cardinal.

The French Carmelites increased rapidly in numbers and reputation. So early as the year 1605, two additional convents were founded, one at Pontoise, the other at Dijon; and in the course of a few years similar communities were established at Amiens, Tours, Rouen, and Bordeaux. By the close of the century the Order possessed no fewer than sixty-three houses in different parts of France.†

Pope Paul V., by a brief of April 17, 1614, placed the Carmelite sisterhoods in France under the government of three ecclesiastics, De Bérulle, Gallemand, and Duval; the first-named being appointed Visitor-General. This arrangement gave rise to considerable dissatisfaction, inasmuch as hitherto the superiors of the Carmelites had always been members of

* See the life of the "Mère Marie de Jésus," in the appendix to M. Victor Cousin's *Jeunesse de Madame de Longueville*. She was the second prioress of the convent in the Faubourg S.

Jacques, elected in 1616, and re-elected several times.

† V. Cousin, *Jeunesse de Madame de Longueville*, p. 335.

the same monastic society, and bound by the same vows, with those who were subject to their rule.* The convent of Bordeaux raised the standard of opposition; the nuns renounced De Bérulle as their visitor, and were supported in their opposition by Cardinal de Sourdis, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who declared that they were lawfully subject to the Superior-General of the Carmelites, and to him alone. The nuns of Saintes, Limoges, Bourges, and Morlaix hastened to imitate their ecclesiastical sisters; the dissension widened rapidly, and assumed the aspect of a serious scandal. De Bérulle appealed to Rome; and in due time two briefs arrived from Gregory XV. (March 20, Sept. 12, 1620) confirming the original appointments, and enjoining the Carmelites to submit without further question. Even this was not at once effectual. The refractory nuns, instigated by secret agitators, appealed, *comme d'abus*, to the Parliament; a step which in all probability would have protracted the contest for a length of time, but that the Government now interfered, and two peremptory *arrêts* of the Council of State (Sept. 16, Dec. 15, 1620) enforced the execution of the Pope's briefs, notwithstanding the appeal to the secular courts. Summary measures followed. Cardinals de la Rochefoucauld and La Valette were charged with the duty of giving effect to the orders of the Holy See, and they deputed as their commissioner a doctor of the Sorbonne named Louytre, a man of few scruples and determined vigour. He forthwith repaired to the Carmelite house at Bourges, and, the nuns having refused to make submission, he passed sentence of excommunication on them all. Firm in their purpose under this extreme penalty, they quitted their convent and their native land, and sought an asylum in the Netherlands. Similar rigours were exercised towards the Carmelites

* D'Avrigny (*Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 30 *et seqq.*) describes this affair of the Carmelites in a somewhat satirical vein, insinuating that Madame Acarie was but a visionary enthusiast, and treating De Bérulle in the same style. No doubt Madame Acarie, as well as other disciples of François de Sales, had imbibed largely the spirit of their master, whose theology was decidedly that of the mystical school. His theory of the love of God, and of the communion of the soul with Him, tends

strongly towards the system which was afterwards known as Quietism. It is certain, however, that the mysticism of St. François was no mere state of passive contemplation; his was not a religion which dispensed with good works and ignored external ordinances. D'Avrigny, as a Jesuit, cannot altogether divest himself of party prejudice in this matter; De Bérulle, in particular, having been an object of jealous dislike to the Order.

of Bordeaux and of S. Pol de Léon in Brittany. In the latter case Louytre went so far as to lay the Cathedral Church under an interdict, and to suspend the bishop of the diocese from his functions, because certain novices had been admitted at the excommunicated convent with his sanction. These violent proceedings led to further troubles. The bishop complained to the Assembly of the Clergy; the latter passed a resolution denouncing the intolerant conduct of the Papal Commissioner and sent a circular letter to their colleagues throughout France desiring them to exclude the offender from communion when he visited their diocese, until he had given public satisfaction to the Church, and in particular to the Bishop of St. Pol de Léon. The Pope (Urban VIII.) now interposed, and annulled the declaration of the clergy. The clergy remonstrated, and asked permission to hold a National Council; and matters began to look so threatening, that Louis XIII. found it necessary to intercede with the Pope in behalf of the indignant Gallican priesthood, who on this, as on so many other occasions, made a gallant stand in defence of the true principles of ecclesiastical discipline. Urban yielded to the king's representations; Louytre was instructed to apologize to the bishops, which he seems to have done with a bad grace and in a tone of self-justification rather than of humility; and in 1625 this unseemly strife was at last brought to a conclusion. The excommunicated nuns were absolved, but were compelled nevertheless to take up their residence in Flanders. Those only were allowed to remain in France who had accepted the government by De Bérulle and his successors imposed on them by the Roman See.*

It would appear that the whole of this disturbance was the secret work of the Jesuits. In their jealousy and spite against the Oratorians, of which congregation De Bérulle was Superior-General, they stirred up the Carmelites to contest the injunctions from Rome, hoping that the result might be detrimental to the influence of the rival Order. "Ces choses," wrote De Bérulle to Cardinal Richelieu, "sont plus dignes de larmes que de paroles." †

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i., p. 38.

† See his letter to the cardinal,

quoted at length by Guettée, *Hist. de l'Egl. de France*, tom. x. p. 77.

Madame Acarie, having been left a widow in 1613, determined to devote the remainder of her life to God as a professed nun of the Carmelite Order. Her sons were grown up, and her daughters, as we have seen, already inmates of the cloister; and being thus freed from secular ties, she no longer resisted the yearnings of her heart after the cultivation of ascetic virtue in what she considered its most perfect form. She took the veil in the convent at Amiens in April, 1614, under the name of Sœur Marie de l'Incarnation, and made her profession in the following year. In this new state of life she became a bright example of Christian humility, self-sacrifice, and holiness; but her health, always feeble, gave way under the austerities which she daily practised, and which she could not be persuaded to relax. She breathed her last at the convent of Pontoise, in the odour of sanctity, on the 18th of April, 1618. Her extraordinary reputation for piety, and the prodigious influence she had exercised on the religious movement of her time, procured for her conspicuous tokens of honour after death. Her tomb at Pontoise was visited by Queen Anne of Austria, by the Queen Dowager Mary of Medici, by François de Sales, by Madame de Chantal, and by a multitude of less illustrious pilgrims. Sœur Marie de l'Incarnation was beatified* by Pope Pius VI., May 24, 1791.

Another proof of the revival of religious zeal in the same direction was the institution, in 1607, of the "Congregation des Filles de Notre Dame" by Jeanne de Lestonnac, Marquise de Monferrant. This was a sisterhood devoted to the education of young females; an undertaking of urgent necessity at that time, since the Huguenots had made energetic efforts for the instruction of the rising generation, and had lured away numbers of young Catholics from their Mother Church, especially in the southern provinces. There were then at Bordeaux two Jesuit missionaries who had acquired a high reputation by their labours, and had been the means of numerous conversions to the faith among the Protestant sectaries. They had long felt the importance of systematic exertion in the work of education;

* Beatification is the preliminary step to canonization. It declares the individual to be among the number of the blessed, and permits the faithful to honour him religiously, with certain

limitations; but he is not definitely added to the catalogue of the saints, and has no day assigned to him in the calendar.

they saw, with dismay, that through the negligence of the Church in this branch of her duty, the early training of the young, especially of young females, was fast passing into the hands of the Huguenots; Catholic parents being almost compelled, through dearth of competent teachers in their own communion, to entrust their children to the separatists, who of course imbued them with their own misbelief. It seems to have struck the two Jesuits suddenly and simultaneously that Madame de Lestonnac (whom as yet they knew only by report) was one eminently fitted to take the lead in some attempt to remedy this evil. The proposal, when made to her, coincided exactly with her own long-cherished aspirations, and was at once gratefully embraced. There were obstacles to be encountered, however, in the execution of the design. The Court of Rome was at this time disposed rather to diminish than to increase the number of religious houses; and Cardinal de Sourdis, Archbishop of Bordeaux, when applied to for his sanction, proposed to Madame Lestonnac, instead of founding a new Order, to undertake the restoration of an existing Ursuline convent, which of late years had fallen into decay. This she declined. Even long the Cardinal's sentiments underwent a sudden change;—a change which he felt to be so extraordinary, that he was compelled to attribute it to a directly supernatural interposition. He now cordially approved Madame Lestonnac's scheme, and recommended it so strongly at Rome, that the bull for carrying it into effect was despatched without further difficulty. The new community was established forthwith, and adopted the rule of St. Benedict. In its internal organization it was formed upon the model of the Society of Jesus; its rules and discipline being identical with those prescribed by Ignatius Loyola, with such slight variations as were required by reason of the difference of the sex and occupation. On the 1st of May, 1608 Cardinal Sourdis bestowed the veil and habit of the Order, with all solemnity, on the foundress and four other ladies whom she had trained as her associates. The letters patent were granted by Henry IV., at the special request of Marie de Medicis, in March, 1609. Such was the origin of the "*Congregation de la bienheureuse et toujours Vierge Mère de Dieu Notre Dame*;"—the earliest religious foundation in France devoted to female education. The work prospered from the beginning, and pro-

pagated itself with wonderful rapidity. In the course of a few years these sisterhoods were planted in all the principal towns of Languedoc and Gascony. Wherever they settled they rendered invaluable services; and such was the estimation in which they were held that in process of time they were invited into Spain, and laboured with success in many parts of Catalonia and Castille. Madame Lestonnac survived to witness, in a venerable old age, the remarkable progress of her pious enterprise. She died in 1640, at the age of eighty-four.*

It was about the same time that a kindred institution took its rise, whose history is one of special interest, namely the Order of Visitandines, founded by François de Sales at his episcopal city of Annécy. Its first Superior was one of the most celebrated of those many Christian heroines whom that age produced in France, Jeanne Françoise de Chantal.

This was a work which the saintly Bishop of Geneva always contemplated with peculiar satisfaction, calling it "his joy and crown." For many years he had been meditating a scheme for enlisting in the service of the Church females who from advanced age or delicate health were unequal to the severer discipline of cloistered life. Cases came under his observation in which such persons, finding none to encourage them to systematic exertion or to direct their energies, lost all interest in higher objects, and abandoned themselves listlessly to habits of mere worldliness. During a visit to Dijon, where he preached in Lent, 1604, the Bishop first made the acquaintance of Madame de Chantal, who had recently lost her husband, and was residing there with her father, M. de Fremiot, a President of the Parliament of Burgundy. She had married at the age of twenty the Baron de Chantal, of the same province, head of the ancient family of Rabutin. The union proved happy, but was abruptly terminated by the death of the Baron, who was accidentally shot by a companion on a hunting expedition. Madame de Chantal now made a vow to pass the rest of her days in a state of devout widowhood; and in token of this life-long consecration to her Saviour, she imprinted the letters I.H.S. upon her breast with a hot iron. In answer to her importunate prayers that God would provide for her a guide capable of conducting

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i., p. 60, et seqq. Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres Monast.*, tom. vi.

her in the path of perfection, we are told that one day she saw before her, during a walk in the country, a figure in soutane and rochet, with a square cap on his head,—in short, the ordinary costume of a bishop,—and heard at the same moment a voice declaring that this was the director she was seeking, and that upon him she might in all security repose her conscience. No sooner did François de Sales make his appearance in the pulpit, than she recognised the object of this superhuman intuition; while the bishop, on his part, notwithstanding the difficulty of distinguishing an individual among the crowd of his hearers, became conscious of the presence of one whom he had seen in a vision before quitting his diocese, and whom he he now knew for his destined coadjutor in the work which lay so near his heart.* Madame de Chantal at once placed herself under his spiritual rule; and after some time spent in preparatory discipline, the bishop unfolded to her his project for the Order of the Visitation, and his desire that she should undertake the office of superior. Although she received the proposal with transport, she felt nevertheless that there were manifold obstacles which must retard, and might altogether prevent, its being realized. Her four children were of tender age, and maternal responsibility weighed heavily upon her mind; added to which her father was at this time labouring under infirmities which made him almost wholly dependent on her filial care. For years she waited till the way should be made clear, cherishing an unflinching confidence that in the end her heart's desire would be accomplished. In course of time her eldest daughter was married to the Baron de Thorens, brother of the Bishop of Geneva. The two younger girls were then placed by their mother in a religious house where she was satisfied that they would be carefully educated; and her only son, the heir of the Rabutins, was committed to the charge of his grandfather De Fremiot, one well fitted for the trust by his virtues and experience.† Thus it came to pass that by the summer of 1610 Madame de Chantal was so situated that she could follow with

* *Vie de S. Fr. de Sales*, par le curé de S. Sulpice, tom. i. Liv. iv. p. 494.

† This young nobleman was killed in 1627, in defence of the Ile de Rhé against the English under the Duke of

Buckingham. His only child, Marie de Rabutin, married Henri, Marquis de Sevigné, and was the celebrated Madame de Sevigné.

a safe conscience the track which she believed to be marked out for her by Providence; and although, when the hour of parting came, the separation from her father, her children, her friends and attached dependents, was more severe than she expected, and almost overcame her fortitude, she was enabled to persevere; and after finally disposing of her property, the whole of which she gave up to her relatives, she quitted Dijon for Annécý in June, 1610, and entered on her new career. Her only companions were two young ladies of good family, Jacqueline Favre and Charlotte de Bréhard, attracted by similar motives towards the work in hand. After completing their noviciate, they pronounced their vows, which were simple, before François de Sales on the 6th of June, 1611; and shortly afterwards the Pope approved the Congregation of the Visitation, and placed it under the rule of St. Augustine. Such was the commencement of this famous Order, which so prospered in the sequel, that even in the lifetime of the foundress it possessed seventy-five convents in France and Savoy. By the close of the century the number exceeded one hundred.

Madame de Chantal died at Moulins in December, 1641, on her return from a visit to the chateau of St. Germain, whither she had been specially summoned by Queen Anne of Austria. She was beatified by Benedict XIV. in 1751, and canonized in 1767 by Clement XIII.

In the history of the ecclesiastical reformation which distinguished these times, the name of Cardinal de Bérulle has been so often mentioned as to be already familiar to the reader; but his character and labours were too important to be passed over without more detailed examination. Pierre de Bérulle, descended from an ancient family in Champagne, was born at the chateau of Serilly, near Troyes, in February, 1575. His father was a councillor of the Parliament of Paris; his mother was Louise de Seguier, aunt of the Chancellor of that name, who flourished during the Fronde. Pierre de Bérulle was the eldest son, and heir to the family estate; yet he determined at an early age to embrace the ecclesiastical profession. The motives which governed him were most disinterested. Possessed of many worldly advantages, he was free from all taint of personal ambition; and we are told that he privately made a vow never to accept any preferment to which emolument was attached.

He was ordained in 1599, was appointed one of the king's chaplains, and acted as assistant to Cardinal Du Perron at the conference of Fontainebleau. De Bérulle rapidly acquired the reputation of an accomplished divine; excelling as a controversialist, and as a skilful guide in the confessional. The general estimate of his powers may be gathered from a *mot* of Cardinal Du Perron: "If you wish to convince the heretics, bring them to me; if you desire to convert them, take them to the Bishop of Geneva; but if the object is both to convince and to convert them, you must go to the Abbé de Bérulle."*

The undertaking from which the name of De Bérulle has acquired its chief distinction is the foundation of the French congregation of the "Oratory of Jesus." It has been before observed that the state of the secular clergy at this period was one of lamentable degeneracy. "In the rural districts," writes a contemporary prelate,† "the people were like scattered sheep, without spiritual pasture, without Sacraments, without instruction, and with scarcely any external aids towards their salvation. Many even of the bishops thought of nothing beyond the luxurious enjoyment of their revenues, and were quite negligent of their pastoral duties. From these irregularities it followed that the priesthood sunk into such general discredit and contempt, that for persons of any position it was reckoned a degradation to take holy orders, except for the sake of being able to hold some valuable benefice. The village curés were for the most part like those shepherds of whom the prophet speaks, who contented themselves with taking the wool and the milk of the flock, but neglected to give them that food which is indispensable to the life of souls. Thus the people fell into such a state of profound ignorance as scarcely to know whether or not there is a God. Of the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation they had no apprehension whatever; nor were they at all better instructed as to the Holy Sacraments, and the dispositions with which they ought to be approached." It may be hoped, however, that this picture is somewhat overcoloured. At all events the state of things was not so scandalous in the capital and the great towns.

The inefficiency of the national clergy was viewed with deep

* Tabaraud, *Hist. du Card. de Bérulle*, tom. i. p. 33.

† Abelly, Bishop of Rodez, in his *Life of S. Vincent de Paul.*

concern by those admirable men who were labouring for the restoration of the Church of France to something like its ancient strength and power. François de Sales, César de Bus,* the Jesuit Cotton, Vincent de Paul, Pierre de Bérulle, with others, conferred long and anxiously together as to the means to be adopted for raising the tone of feeling and standard of duty among their brethren in the ministry. De Bérulle was the first to suggest the plan of an association of priests upon the pattern of that which had been formed in Italy under the direction of St. Philip Neri—the members of which took no special vows, and were not bound to practise the conventual life, but simply devoted themselves to the fulfilment of the obligations inherent in the sacerdotal office, according to their true extent and meaning. The same idea had been already conceived by Madame Acarie, who seems to have had an instinctive persuasion that De Bérulle was designed by Heaven to be the instrument of its execution.† “For a long time past,” she wrote in 1606 to her confessor F. Cotton, “I have been urging M. de Bérulle to attempt this enterprise, but as yet he will not consent. He *must* do it. Help me to persuade him of this.” The matter was pressed upon De Bérulle from various quarters, but his characteristic modesty led him to withstand, as long as it was possible, the call to initiate such an arduous undertaking. He strove to prevail upon others to accept the charge, addressing himself especially to François de Sales and to Gallemant, an eminent doctor of the Sorbonne; but the former declined it on the score of his episcopal duties, the latter on that of his advanced age. Thus the affair stood over from year to year; but at length, on the combined instances of the Chancellor de Silleri, Cardinal de Joyeuse, Gondi, Bishop of Paris, and, it is said, of the Queen Regent herself, De Bérulle signified his readiness to commence this “work of faith and labour of love” which the Church so clearly demanded at his hands. On the 10th of November, 1611, he took up his abode, in company with four other ecclesiastics, at the hotel du Petit-Bourbon, in the Faubourg S. Jacques, on a part of the site now occupied by the Val de Grace.‡

* Founder of the “Frères de la doctrine Chrétienne.” He laboured chiefly in Provence and Languedoc, and died in 1607.

† D’Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 163.

‡ The Faubourg S. Jacques contained such a multitude of religious

The names of his first colleagues were Jean Bence, Jacques Gastaud, both doctors of the Sorbonne; Paul Métézeau, one of the most esteemed preachers of the day; and François Bourgoing, curé of Clichy, afterwards General of the Society. The letters patent declared the Oratory to be a house of "royal foundation." In October of the following year the Bishop of Paris officially approved the statutes; and on the 10th of May, 1613, the bull of institution was forwarded by Pope Paul V.*

The founders of the Oratory did not propose to create a new monastic order; the object was to promote among the clergy a spirit of combination for improvement in those studies which became their profession, and through which alone they could hope to glorify God and minister to the edification of His Church.† The Oratorians, whether in Italy, in France, in the Low Countries, or elsewhere, were united by no bonds save those of Christian charity; they undertook no duties beyond those to which they had pledged themselves on entering the sacred ministry. In consideration of the peculiar necessities of the Gallican Church, they were to practise the utmost simplicity of living, and strict self-denial with regard to worldly comforts; they were likewise to forego all thought of ecclesiastical preferment, and to labour without remuneration. They were at liberty to quit the Society whenever they pleased; and while they belonged to it, they were subject, like the rest of the clergy, to the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishops. "The spirit

houses at this period, that it acquired the name of the "Thebaïde," in allusion to the celebrated retreat of the Egyptian cœnobites in the fourth century.

* The following notice of the foundation of the Oratory appears in the *Mercure François* for 1613, p. 288:—"Sous le nom de Prêtres de l'Oratoire s'est établie au Faubourg S. Jacques une nouvelle congregation. Ce sont tous prêtres ayant des commodités, et gens doctes vivant en communauté comme religieux. La plus grande partie du jour ils sont en prières et meditations. Ils portent la soutane comme les prêtres Romains (apparently this was not the usual dress of the clergy in France at this time) ils ont aussi un long manteau et le collet rabattu et non haussé comme celui des Jesuites. Plusieurs ont loué cette congregation, comme aussi est elle louable; et d'autres lui

ont été contraires."

† They cherished a special devotion to the person of the incarnate Saviour, the mysteries of His nature, the events of His life, and His mediatorial work. "Speciali religione Jesum Christum et Beatam Virginem colunt, Illius vitam et mysteria in omnibus suis actionibus, meditationibus, et sermonibus venerantur ut suum Patronum et totius vitæ Exemplar. Propterea Congregatio Oratorii Jesu Christi nuncupatur, et votivis precibus quotidie suam erga Jesum Christum servitutum profitentur, et in Scripturarum sanctarum lectione perpetuâ Jesum Christum maximè scrutantur. Sanè vero ex hoc pietatis intimo affectu erga Christum elucet quædam sublimis divinarum rerum scientia, quæ tam in libris piis quam in sermonibus manifestatur." — *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 977.

of this congregation," says Bossuet, in his funeral oration for F. Bourgoing, "is none other than that of the Church herself; it acknowledges no other rules than her sacred canons, no other superiors than her bishops, no other vows than those of baptism and the priesthood. With them a holy liberty constitutes a holy engagement; here we find obedience without dependence, government without command; all authority consists in gentleness, and penitence is maintained without the aid of fear. Here, in order to form true priests, they are conducted to the source of all truth; they have the Inspired Writings constantly in their hands, that they may seek unceasingly the interpretation of them by study, their spirit by prayer, their depth by meditation, their power by experience, their end by charity, in which grace everything is summed up—which is the sole essential treasure of Christianity."*

Tabaraud mentions† that certain prelates summoned De Bérulle before them to give an explanation of his views in instituting the Oratory. "Although," says the biographer, "he might have declined their jurisdiction, the pious founder replied modestly that he had only acted according to the orders of his ecclesiastical superior; and when they proceeded to enquire what were the statutes of his Congregation, he contented himself with quoting a passage from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians: "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." "This," said De Bérulle, "is my rule." The bishops were so much struck by this response, that they forbore to trouble him with any further questions.

The congregation of the Oratory soon gave proof of being well adapted to meet one of the most pressing exigencies of the time; and made rapid progress in numbers, reputation, and

* Thus, too, D'Avrigny, *Mémoire Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 163. "Quoiqu'ils aient des supérieurs, ils n'en dependent pas que pour le bon ordre et la police, chaque particulier ne tenant au corps que par des liens qu'il est toujours maître de rompre. C'est ce qui fit dire un jour à un grand magistrat dans un plaidoyer, que l'Oratoire est un corps où tout le monde obeit, et personne ne

commande. Si cette liberté affaiblit d'un coté la congrégation, elle la soutient de l'autre, en lui procurant des sujets qui sont bien aises de trouver un asile honorable où la vertu peut se soutenir sans courir la risque d'une dépendance éternelle fort à charge à la nature."

† *Histoire de Bérulle*, tom. i. p. 161.

influence. In 1616 it became necessary to move into a larger building, and De Bérulle purchased from the Duchess of Guise, sister of Cardinal de Joyeuse, the Hotel de Bouchage, near the Louvre, an ancient possession of that family. Here the Oratorians laboured with great success, particularly among persons of rank connected with the Court, many of whom were constant attendants at their lectures, servicès, and “conférences spirituelles.” A few years later the first stone of a new church for the Society, in the same quartier, was laid with much pomp by the Duc de Montbazon, in the name and on behalf of Louis XIII. It was declared one of the chapels royal, and its clergy were entitled “chaplains of the Louvre.” This became one of the most celebrated churches of the capital. It contained a splendid monument to Cardinal de Bérulle, one of the finest works of François Auguier, which was unhappily demolished at the Revolution. After suffering shameful desecration, the church was appropriated to the Protestants of the Genevese Confession, by whom it is still occupied. Its graceful chevet, or apse, forms a well-known ornament of the Rue St. Honoré.

In 1618 Cardinal de Gondi, Bishop of Paris, obtained letters patent for converting the suppressed Abbey of S. Magloire, in the Faubourg S. Jacques, into a seminary for the education of priests in his diocese, and placed it under the direction of the Fathers of the Oratory. This institution, the earliest founded for that purpose in Paris, proved most valuable and successful. Here laboured the accomplished Louis Thomassin, who has enriched the Church with his masterly dissertations on ecclesiastical discipline, on positive theology, on the doctrine of grace, and on the history of the Councils.* Here, too, Charles Le Cointe compiled his ponderous ‘*Annales Ecclesiastici Francorum*,’ in eight volumes folio. Thomassin was succeeded in his professorship at St. Magloire by the no less celebrated Jacques-Joseph Duguet, whose conferences always attracted a crowded and enthusiastic auditory.

* This latter work of Thomassin’s was suppressed, on account of some few passages which were not sufficiently Gallican in tone as to the authority of the Pope. “Quùm in libro hoc de auctoritate Pontificis tradita essent, quæ Ecclesiæ displicebant Gallicæ, sup-

pressus ille fuit; nonnullis autem plagulis mutatis, permissum est ut liberè in lucem exiret. Quæ et caussa est, cur unus tantum operis hujus tomus in eruditorum manibus versetur.”—Walch, *Bibliothec. Theol.*, tom. iii. p. 873.

The Oratorians afterwards acquired a third establishment in Paris, situated in the Faubourg St. Michel, which they styled "L'institution." It was devoted to the elementary instruction of young men who presented themselves for admission to the Congregation.

In the three great departments of theological literature, preaching, and clerical education, the priests of the Oratory produced results to which the Gallican Church is deeply indebted, and their names will ever be inscribed on some of the brightest pages of its annals. A considerable space would be required to give even a catalogue of these worthies. It was Jean François Senault* who emancipated the Church from that turgid, pedantic, tasteless style of pulpit eloquence, which characterized the age of the Renaissance. Senault's discourses were refined, intellectual, classical; and during the forty years in which he was engaged as a preacher in Paris and the provinces, a complete transformation took place among the clergy with regard to this branch of their ministrations. Many Oratorians formed themselves upon the model of Senault, who are more generally known to fame than their master; and by some of these the art of preaching was carried to the highest pitch of excellence. Two of his most renowned disciples may be mentioned here in passing—Jules Mascaron, Bishop of Agen, and Jean Baptiste Massillon, Bishop of Clermont.

But it was in the field of education—especially of education for the ministry of the Church—that the genius of the Oratory displayed its most brilliant colours. De Bérulle possessed in a singular degree the faculty of attaching the minds of the young. This spirit was emulated by his fellow labourers, and became the leading feature of the Congregation. Their colleges and seminaries were filled with students, a large proportion of whom belonged to the upper orders. In 1612 Cardinal de Joyeuse, Archbishop of Rouen, sent thirty candidates for the ministry to Paris to be trained by De Bérulle and his colleagues; and subsequently he opened a diocesan seminary at Rouen, which he entrusted to their management. They were next summoned for a similar purpose to Langres, afterwards to Lyons by Cardinal de Marquemont, and in like manner to several other cathedral

* Senault was elected General of the Oratory in 1661, and died in 1672.

cities. The popularity of this great work excited ere long the jealousy of the Jesuits, who ever since their re-establishment in France had aimed at monopolizing the superior education of the country. During the early part of his career De Bérulle had enjoyed the special confidence of the fathers of that Order, under whom he studied for some years in his youth. He had had the courage to befriend them in their banishment—had exerted himself personally, and through the interest of influential relatives, to procure their recall—and in recognition of these services had received letters of affiliation from the General Acquaviva.* But no sooner did he start the plan of a Society which was likely to compete for the occupation of ground which they considered exclusively their own, than the Jesuits became his bitter opponents. They strained every nerve to thwart his undertaking, descending for this purpose to the meanest practices—to unblushing detraction and vulgar libels. The strife became complicated by the subsequent course of events. The Oratory and the Company of Jesus espoused opposite sides of the questions in dispute in the Jansenistic controversy; and their dissensions inflicted infinite injury on their common cause and on their mother Church.

* Tabaraud, *Hist. de Card. de Bérulle*, tom. i. p. 21.

CHAPTER VI.

IN order to preserve a connected view of the many memorable efforts of ecclesiastical reform which crowd the early years of the century, we have purposely abstained from noticing the course of political transactions during this period. It is time, however, to turn our attention for a while to the events of secular history, which will be found closely interwoven with the affairs and interests of the Church of France.

Henry IV., on the eve of quitting Paris on a military expedition, the results of which might have wrought momentous changes in the fortunes of Europe, received his death-blow from the hand of a wretched fanatic, François Ravallac, on the 14th of May, 1610. Amid the profound consternation which this sudden calamity produced among all classes of his people, the more religiously-minded of the monarch's friends consoled themselves by recalling the proofs which he had given, during his later years, of concern for his spiritual welfare; though it must be confessed that, when placed in juxtaposition with the ordinary tenor of his life, these indications were not altogether satisfactory.

We learn from the testimony of his confessor, Father Cotton, that Henry had his moments of fervent and intense devotion. He was often bathed in tears at the feet of his spiritual adviser; and "that great soul, which knew no fear, appeared so deeply penetrated by the thought and presence of God, that no room was left to doubt the sincerity of his penitence. Sometimes he would pass whole days absorbed in religious exercises, attending to nothing and speaking of nothing but God and the means of salvation." Never were these sentiments of piety and anxiety for his soul's welfare more strongly manifested than during the last year of his life. Even in the midst of festivities and rejoicings he was continually occupied with the affairs of religion. Being at St. Denis on the occasion of the queen's coronation,—the day before his death,—he caused Cotton to

accompany him into a glazed gallery, where he could witness the ceremony without being himself seen. Here, looking down upon the thronging crowds who filled the choir and aisles of the church, he took the priest aside, and pointing to the vast multitude below, "You do not know," said he, "what I was thinking of just now, as I surveyed this scene? I was thinking of the last judgment, and of the account which every one of us must then render to God."* St. François de Sales, between whom and Henry there existed a warm personal regard, expressed himself in the following terms in a letter to his friend Des^s Hayes:—(May 27th, 1610.)—"The happiest event in the life of this great sovereign was that by which, in making himself a child of the Church, he made himself the father of France; in becoming a sheep of the good Shepherd, he became the shepherd of a densely-peopled kingdom; and, in converting his own soul to God, he converted the hearts of all good Catholics to himself. It is this blessed circumstance that makes me hope that the tender and merciful Providence of our Heavenly Father instilled into that royal heart, even at the last moment of life, the contrition which is necessary to a happy death. And, therefore, I implore that infinite Goodness to show mercy to one who showed such clemency to his fellow men, to pardon one who extended pardon to so many enemies, and to receive into glory this reconciled soul, who received so many into favour upon their reconciliation with himself."†

Taking advantage of the outburst of national indignation that followed the king's murder, the Parliament of Paris lost no time in striking a blow against the Jesuits, who were popularly presumed to be implicated in the crime. On the very day of Ravallac's execution, June 4, the Faculty of Theology assembled at the Sorbonne by order of the Parliament, for the purpose of confirming and renewing a decree passed by that body, in the year 1413, against persons who maintained that it was lawful and right, under certain circumstances, for subjects to put a tyrant to death. This decree was occasioned by the assassination of the Duke of Orleans, brother of Charles VI., and the extraordinary justification of that bloody deed by Jean Petit, a Franciscan monk and doctor of the Sorbonne, in his

* *Vie du Père Coton*, par le P. Orléans, p. 142, et seqq.

† *Œuvres de S. François de Sales*, tom. ix. p. 197.

public defence of the murderer, the Duke of Burgundy. The Faculty unanimously re-affirmed the decree in question; and pronounced it "seditious, impious, and heretical, to lay hands upon the sacred persons of kings and princes, upon any pretext whatsoever;" and all doctors and bachelors of divinity were enjoined to bind themselves by a solemn oath to uphold and teach this doctrine.

Four days later the Parliament issued an arrêt condemning a notorious publication of the Spanish Jesuit Mariana, entitled 'De Rege et Regis Institutione.' This was sentenced to be burnt by the common hangman, as containing "many execrable blasphemies against the late King Henry IV., and against the persons and states of kings and sovereign princes."* It was true that Mariana had maintained, with certain qualifications, the lawfulness of tyrannicide;† and it was pretended that Ravailiac had imbibed from this source the detestable maxims which had led him to lift his murderous hand against "the best of kings." The outcry against the Jesuits becoming louder and more furious, Father Cotton deemed it necessary to interfere on behalf of his vilified order; he addressed a letter to the Queen Regent, showing that they had repudiated Mariana's doctrine several years previously, and declaring that they accepted and approved *ex animo* the recent decree of the Sorbonne. The Bishop of Paris now came forward, and in the most public manner testified to the innocence of the Jesuits with respect to the charge of complicity in the death of the king;‡ and, as a further measure of self-exculpation, the General Aquaviva prohibited all members of the Order, under the heaviest penalties, from teaching or writing aught that might seem

* Bayle, in his Dictionary (under the word Mariana) says, "Il n'y a rien de plus séditieux, ni de plus capable d'exposer les trônes à de fréquentes révolutions, et la vie même des princes au couteau des assassins, que ce livre de Mariana." In one passage Mariana justifies in express terms the crime of Jacques Clement on the ground that he had *ascertained from several theologians*, whom he had consulted, that a tyrant may lawfully be put to death.

† "Hoc omne genus pestiferum et exitiale ex hominum communitate

exterminare gloriosum est. Enimverò membra quædam secantur, si putrida sunt, ne reliquum corpus inficiant. Sic ista, in hominis specie, bestię immanitas à Republicâ tanquam à corpore amoveri debet, ferroque excindi. Timeat videlicet necesse est, qui terret, neque major sit terror incussus quam motus susceptus." Mariana, *De Rege*, &c., Lib. i. p. 64.

‡ See his "lettre testimoniale," quoted by M. Cretineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. iii, p. 157.

to sanction or excuse, in the remotest degree, the atrocious crime of parricide.* The arrêt of the Parliament contained a clause ordering the decree of the Sorbonne against tyrannicide to be read on the same day in every year at a public assembly of the Faculty; and likewise to be published in all the parish churches of the capital during divine service. The Bishop of Paris complained of this latter injunction to the Council of State, as an interference with his diocesan jurisdiction; and it was in consequence suppressed.

The Parliament, however, though silenced for the moment, was by no means satisfied; nor did the popular ferment against the Jesuits at all subside. In November of the same year the Society fell once more under the lash of their enemies, in consequence of a treatise recently put forth by Cardinal Bellarmine, ‘*De potestate Summi Pontificis in temporalibus*,’ in which the Ultramontane theory was maintained as to the superiority of the Pope over all secular potentates. This work of Bellarmine’s was a reply to one by William Barclay, entitled, ‘*De potestate Papæ, et quatenus in Reges et Principes seculares jus et imperium habeat*.’ The controversy arose originally out of the measures taken by James I. and the English Parliament, after the Gunpowder Plot, with a view to prevent future attempts on the part of Roman Catholics against the king’s crown and person. In the “Oath of Allegiance,” which was then imposed upon all Catholics in England, they were called upon to disavow, as “impious, heretical, and damnable,” the position that “princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other whatsoever.” It thereupon became a question, whether an oath thus expressed could be taken by members of the Church of Rome with a safe conscience. Upon this point there was a division of opinion; the secular clergy, headed by their Archpriest Blackwell, were for the most part willing to accept the oath; the Jesuits, on the other hand, were decidedly opposed to it. Reference having been made to Rome, Pope Paul V. addressed a brief to Blackwell condemning the oath as unlawful, since it contained many things

* D’Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, vol. i. p. 114. Le Vassor, *Histoire de Louis XIII.*, Liv. i. pp. 47, 48.

contrary to faith and salvation.* In the following year, 1607, the Pope found it necessary to issue a *second* brief to the same purpose, addressed to the whole body of English Roman Catholics;† and this was accompanied by an expostulatory letter from Cardinal Bellarmine to the Archpriest Blackwell, in which the ultramontane principles concerning the Papal authority were unequivocally set forth. Upon this King James, who was notoriously vain of his talents as an author, published an ‘Apology for the Oath of Allegiance;’ it was at first anonymous, but the second edition was authenticated by his name, and prefaced by a “premonition to all Christian princes.” His Majesty’s manifesto was answered by Cardinal Bellarmine, the most renowned controversial champion of the Roman curia; who, following the example of his royal antagonist, appeared at first under the nom de plume of Matthieu Tortus, and subsequently in a treatise, ‘De Romano Pontifice,’ to which he appended his name.‡ William Barclay now entered the arena, and attacked Bellarmine; whereupon the Cardinal rejoined by the publication above-mentioned, ‘De potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus.’ This met with an indignant and ignominious condemnation from the French Parliament. Being denounced by the Avocat-General Servin, it was suppressed by a decree which made it unlawful to print, sell, or possess the book within the French dominions. The Pope’s nuncio remonstrated vehemently against this sentence, and even threatened to leave France. The Bishop of Paris, and other prelates, supported him; and the Council of State was at length prevailed upon to prohibit all proceedings in the matter, until the royal pleasure should be further signified. The Parliamentary arrêt consequently fell to the ground. This resolution of the Regent and her council is said to have been due to the influence of Cardinal du Perron, who represented that it was inexpedient at the commencement of a new reign,

* “Cum multa contineat quæ fidei et salutis aperte adversentur.”

† It appears that the party favourable to the adoption of the oath had given out that the former brief was *not genuine*, or that at all events it was only to be regarded as containing

the *advice* of the Pope, and not as conveying any command.

‡ This production of Bellarmine’s was placed upon the *Index* by Pope Sixtus V., as not carrying the Papal pretensions to a sufficient length of extravagance.

and during a minority, to do anything openly offensive to the Court of Rome.

The great problems involved in the mutual relations of the spiritual and the temporal power had now, after three centuries of conflict, advanced many stages towards a practical solution. The Church had relinquished, in great measure, her ancient independence in one of its most important particulars, namely the immunity of her ministers from the jurisdiction of the secular tribunals. The royal courts reigned supreme in causes which once belonged to the unquestioned cognizance of the ecclesiastical judge. The Crown had acquired the vast privilege of nominating directly the bishops and other chief dignitaries throughout the realm. All official acts proceeding from the Roman curia required to be "verified" by the Parliament, and sanctioned by the Council of State, before they could be legally put in execution. No bull or rescript could be published, no canons of a Council received as binding, no legate admitted to discharge his mission as the Pope's representative, without undergoing this test of conformity with the maxims of the civil constitution. Added to which, all the proceedings of ecclesiastical authorities were kept in strict control by the oppressive expedient of the "*appel comme d'abus*." Yet, in point of theoretical pretension, the Papacy and its defenders occupied nearly the same ground at the beginning of the 17th century as in the days of Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. It was not found easier in modern than it had been in mediæval times to distinguish with scientific precision the exact province of the Crown from that of the Church. Exaggeration and confusion prevailed on both sides of the controversy. The reaction from such rash displays of Pontifical authority as the excommunications of the Venetians by Sixtus IV., of Elizabeth of England by Pius V., of Henry of Navarre by Sixtus V., and others, led men to deny that Church censures have any force or validity at all, and gave rise to the system called Erastianism. This was partially embraced by the Anglican Hooker,* and was more fully developed by Grotius in his treatise '*De imperio summarum Potestatum circa sacra*.' Grotius attributes to the

* See '*Ecclesiastical Polity*,' Book viii.

civil magistrate almost every ecclesiastical prerogative except the actual functions of preaching and administering the Sacraments. He denies the legislative supremacy of the Church in matters of faith; subjecting its decrees to the revision of the sovereign in the last resort. Thus to reduce one of the two Powers into absolute dependence on the other is virtually to suppress it altogether. But the equilibrium between them was no less endangered by writers of the opposite school, such as Suarez, Petau, Bécán, Bellarmine, when they assigned to the Church a real (though indirect) control over the sovereign in his temporal administration, in virtue of her office as the universal teacher of faith and morals. The principle of independence is thus in like manner subverted, and the Spiritual Element becomes in effect supreme; for the phrase *indirect* power is a mere verbal distinction without real difference.

Bellarmino's reasoning upon the subject corresponds with that of the more moderate section of mediæval theologians; whose theory has been examined in an earlier part of this work.* The ecclesiastical and the temporal power have distinct jurisdictions; the latter, however, is subordinate to the former. Hence it follows that the sovereign Pontiff is superior to kings and princes in things temporal by reason of the relation in which these stand to things spiritual. The authority of the Vicar of Christ extends universally over all the kingdoms of this world, which depend upon him as the centre of unity; and although God has not committed to him any direct, positive, or absolute temporal dominion, yet it is evident that, in case of necessity, he may administer and dispose of the temporal *for the benefit of the spiritual*. Thus he may hinder secular potentates from abusing their power to the injury of the Church, from propagating heresy and schism, and thereby endangering their own souls and those of their subjects; and if they prove refractory, he has the further power of excommunicating them, absolving their subjects from their oath of fidelity, and depriving them of their dominions. At the same time Bellarmine observes that under any and all circumstances the *murder* of a prince is equally contrary to the law of God and of the Church; and that, in point of fact, it is a thing utterly

* See Introduction, pp. 53, 54.

unheard of since the origin of Christianity, that any Pope should have commanded or approved the murder of a sovereign, even were he a heretic, an idolater, or a persecutor.* These principles the Cardinal illustrates by citing the names of many canonists who in times past had maintained the same opinions; he moreover specifies instances in which princes had actually been deposed by Popes, and the decisions of Councils by which such depositions had been authorized. Among others he refers to the case of Childeric, the last of the Merovingian kings, who, he asserts, was deprived of his dominions by the authority of Pope Zacharias; Pepin being by the same authority elevated to the vacant throne.

The discussion was continued by John Barclay, the son of William, who, both in his own name and in that of his father, lately deceased, combated with much vigour and talent the statements of Bellarmine, as regards both principle and fact.† Temporal sovereigns, he says, are indeed subject to the Pope and to the authority of the Church, but it is in their quality of *Christians* and not as kings. The Pope's authority over them is essentially and simply spiritual; and if he visits them with penalties, these can only be such as may be inflicted by a spiritual ruler, namely, penalties exclusively spiritual, not temporal. The two powers are equal and independent, each in its own appointed sphere; they have different ends in view, and different means and weapons whereby to compass them. With reference to Childeric and Pepin, Barclay contends that the events in question were not brought about by the *authority* of

* It was unfortunate, however, as Le Vassor remarks (*Hist. de Louis XIII.*, Liv. i. p. 93), that only so late as the year preceding [November 9, 1609] the Inquisition at Rome should have condemned the arrêt of the French Parliament against the assassin Jean Châtel.

† The title of John Barclay's work is *Publicæ pro regibus, et privatæ pro Gul. Barclaio parente, Vindiciæ*. Paris, 1612. William Barclay, the father, was born in Aberdeenshire in 1546. He emigrated early in life to France, and studied civil law under the celebrated Cujacius. In his work *De regno et regali potestate*, he strenuously defended the independent rights, and

even the despotic power of kings. James I., delighted with this performance, endeavoured to persuade him to settle in England, but in vain. He died at Angers, where he held the professorship of civil law. The son, John Barclay, was born at Pont-à-Mousson in Lorraine, and was one of the most talented men and elegant scholars of his day. The Jesuits laboured to entice him into their Society, but this was prevented by his father. John Barclay was the author of a popular romance, entitled *Argénis*, which describes allegorically the political state of Europe in his time. He died at Rome in 1621.

the Pope, but merely under his counsel and with his approval, since it is clear that Pepin was already, and had been for years, possessed of the reality of regal power, when he applied to Zacharias to acknowledge him as king.

To this treatise of John Barclay's Cardinal Bellarmine did not think proper to make any response; and the controversy was thus permitted to drop for a time.*

With an Italian princess at the head of the government, Italian favourites exercising the chief influence on public affairs, and Jesuit priests occupying the highest posts of honour and confidence, the tendency of religious feeling at the French Court, during the minority of Louis XIII., was unmistakeably Roman and Ultramontane. The Jesuits, finding themselves released from the vigilant control of the great Henry, and secure of the sympathies of the Regent and her advisers, pushed their operations with the utmost energy in all directions, and aimed at nothing short of complete ascendancy in Church and State. They systematically evaded the restrictions imposed on them by the terms of their re-establishment in France; among other things they obtained from the Queen Regent, through the intercession of Father Cotton, permission to give public instruction in the College de Clermont, their head-quarters at Paris. The encroachment roused the well-founded jealousy with which, ever since its introduction into France, the Order had been regarded by the Parliament and the University of Paris. The verification of the letters patent was opposed by the Rector of the University; and the Parliament named the 18th of November, 1610, for the hearing of the cause. When that day arrived, however, the trial was prevented by the arbitrary intervention of the Regent, who forbade the pleadings—an injunction which the magistrates dared not disobey. The cause was accordingly adjourned for a year.

During this interval, a remarkable conflict occurred between the Ultramontane faction and the defenders of the ancient principles distinctive of the Gallican Church, the details of which are interesting in several points of view.

Edmond Richer, Syndic of the Faculty of Theology at Paris,

* See Ellics-Dupin, *Histoire Ecclesiastique du XVII. Siècle*, tom. i., ann. 1610.

was one of the most deeply-learned scholars, as well as one of the most estimable men, of the time. He was born in 1560, at the small town of Chaource, in the diocese of Langres. His parents were too poor to afford him any advantages of education, and he quitted them at an early age for Paris, where he obtained admittance as a pupil of the University, in return for certain services which he rendered at one of the colleges. His talents and unremitting application carried him rapidly through all the lower grades of the academical career, and in his thirtieth year he was received a Doctor of the Sorbonne. Like most young students in those days, Richer embraced the cause of the League, and advocated, in their fullest extent, the maxims, political and religious, by which his party laboured to prevent the accession of Henry IV. to the throne. He even went so far as to justify, in a public thesis, the atrocious crime of the regicide Jacques Clement. Upon the restoration of peace, the young divine betook himself to a caudid study of Holy Scripture, the fathers of the Church, and ecclesiastical history; and eventually found reason to discard his early prepossessions, and to espouse, with equal warmth, the Gallican system of church government and discipline. Advancing steadily in reputation, Richer was appointed Principal of the Collège Le Moine, and in 1600 was named by Henry IV. a member of the Royal Commission for the reform of the University of Paris.* In January, 1608, he was elected Syndic of the Sorbonne; and in this responsible station he soon made himself known as an uncompromising opponent of the Jesuitical school of doctrine, and a fearless champion of the ancient constitution of the Church of France. Considering the nature of the influences which predominated at the court of Mary de Medici, such a man was exposed to the certainty of a hostile attack from the party in power, so soon as a plausible occasion presented itself.

In the month of May, 1611, a chapter-general of the Dominicans was held at the great convent of their Order in the Rue St.

* This reform of the University was an event of no common importance. The Government asserted on this occasion its right to superintend and regulate the entire system of public instruction; the effect of which was that the University was thenceforth "secularized." The doctrine of

the supreme authority of the State in this department was strongly insisted on by the President de Thou and the advocate-general Servin, when the new statutes were formally presented to the Faculties, September 18, 1600. The same principle has prevailed ever since in France.

Jacques. It was customary at such gatherings to give public dissertations on theological subjects; and it had been resolved on the present occasion to make what in modern phrase would be styled a "demonstration" in favour of the absolute supremacy of the Pope, and other Ultramontane inventions. On the appointed day the hall was thronged by a distinguished audience, including the young King, the Queen Regent, the Ministers of State, the Papal Nuncio, and several prelates. The Syndic Richer had received previous information of the purpose of this august assembly; and since, by virtue of his office in the University, he was bound to exercise control over religious sentiments publicly advanced within its jurisdiction, he repaired to the Jacobin convent, with four of his colleagues as witnesses, and placed his official veto on the proposed thesis. Its articles were:—1. The Sovereign Pontiff is infallible in judging on matters of faith and of moral doctrine. 2. In no case whatever is a Council superior to the Pope. 3. It belongs to the Pope to determine doubtful questions, and to confirm or disallow the decisions of Councils. The affirmative of these propositions, said the Syndic, could not be lawfully maintained, inasmuch as they were diametrically opposed to the decrees of the Œcumenical Council of Constance. Coeffeteau, prior of the convent, at once expressed his acquiescence,—the more readily as a similar prohibition had been signified by the law officers of the Crown. But Richer deemed it his duty to insist, further, that reparation should be made to the University for the publication of a thesis so contrary to the known tenets and authoritative teaching of that body; and for this purpose he required that one of the bachelors should make a speech reprobating the views in question, and setting forth the claims of the Council of Constance to the reverent obedience of Catholics. This was done accordingly. The bachelor Claude Bertin ascended the rostrum, and denounced the position that "in no case is a Council superior to the Pope" as false and heretical, inasmuch as it contradicts the definition of the Council of Constance. An attempt was made by the Ultramontanes to parry the force of this argument, by questioning the authority of the Council of Constance, on the ground that its decrees had never been confirmed by the Pope; but Bertin, under the direction of Richer, adduced sufficient proof that Pope Martin V. *had*

approved the acts of the Council; and when it was further objected that that approval was *general*, and did not apply to every decree in particular, it was rejoined that a general approval was all that was necessary, and that the Council of Trent itself had been approved by the Pope in precisely the same manner as that of Constance. Cardinal du Perron, who saw that the discussion was taking a turn which might be damaging to the Papal prerogatives, now interposed, and, with some difficulty, succeeded in putting a stop to the proceedings.

This unexpected issue of the meeting at the Dominican convent was sufficiently mortifying both to the Court and to the Jesuits. The matter, however, was not destined to rest here. The first president of the Parliament, Nicolas de Verdun, after thanking the courageous Syndic for the good service he had just rendered to the king and the state, requested him to draw up a statement of the Gallican doctrine as to the authority of the Pope; whereupon Richer put forth a treatise, '*De Ecclesiasticâ et Politicâ Potestate*,' extracted from a much larger work on the subject, upon which he had spent several years of laborious study. The step excited a violent commotion in the Church, and entailed upon its author a series of troubles and persecutions which terminated only with his life.

This celebrated brochure consisted of no more than 30 pages in quarto, comprising 18 short chapters.* Richer lays down as his leading principle, that the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction resides properly and essentially in the *whole Church*, and is exercised by the Pope and other bishops only instrumentally and ministerially. The Church is a monarchical state, instituted for supernatural ends, and governed supremely by the sovereign pastor of souls, Jesus Christ. The Pope is its ministerial head; his authority extends, not over the Church as a collective body, or as assembled by the representation in a General Council, but only over particular churches, taken singly; which, moreover, he is bound to govern conformably with the decrees and canons of Councils. The gift of infallibility belongs to the Church in its corporate capacity; every individual bishop, and even the Pontiff himself, being liable to error. The decrees and bulls

* The copy in my possession, in two vols., 4to, Coloniae, 1701, contains, in addition to the original treatise, the

author's *Defensio Libelli de ecclesiasticâ et politicâ Potestate*, together with other documents.

of the Pope are obligatory only so far forth as they are in accordance with the canons; his authority consists in interpreting and executing the canons, not in enacting them; nor can he impose any article of doctrine or discipline upon the Church against or without its consent.

With regard to *political* power, Richer affirms that Christ has not conferred upon His Church any temporal jurisdiction. The power of the sword and of physical constraint does not belong to the Church; her sole weapons are those of spiritual censure and excommunication. The sovereign, on the other hand, is the legitimate defender of the laws, and, as such, has the right to use the sword for enforcing the law; and the Church, being "contained in the State" (as St. Optatus says), is subject in temporal matters to the lawful enactments of the civil power. Appeals "*comme d'abus*" are lawful, and ought to be entertained by princes, in their quality of protectors of the canons. The Church has a certain measure of *indirect* power in things temporal, by reason of its spiritual authority; but in no case can this extend to personal constraint, much less to the deposition of a sovereign from the throne.

No sooner had this little volume issued from the press, than a perfect tempest of indignation arose among the partisans of the opposite system, headed by the Nuncio, Cardinal du Perron, the Bishop of Paris, and André Duval, a famous doctor of the Sorbonne. Malicious imputations of all kinds were heaped on the devoted author. Du Perron denounced him to the Queen as an enemy to royalty, a traitor to the Crown of France; while in the same breath, with ludicrous inconsistency, he was charged with exalting the temporal power above the spiritual, and thereby attacking the very foundations of the Catholic Church. On one point his enemies were unanimous—that Richer was a man to be *crushed*, at any cost, and at all hazards. No time was lost in concocting measures to depose him from the office of Syndic of the Sorbonne. The Gallicans, however, were numerous and influential in the Theological Faculty; and it was difficult to find any one of the contrary opinions who could reasonably be put forward as a competitor to the gifted Richer. At length Jean Filesac was selected for the purpose, and no exertion was spared by the Ultramontanes to create such a majority among the doctors as might secure the

success of their candidate, if by any means Richer could be driven from his post.

While these intrigues were in progress, the appeal of the University against the Jesuits, adjourned from the preceding year, came on for hearing before the Parliament, on the 15th of December, 1611. The counsel for the University were the Advocate-General Servin and Pierre de la Martelière. The speech of the latter was a very remarkable performance, abounding with vigorous argument, skilful rhetoric, and eloquent invective. Richer himself gave his assistance in preparing it. "Never can we be secure," said the orator, "so long as these pestilent enemies of the public peace are in the midst of us. When they first appeared, ominous predictions were made in the very place where I am now speaking, as to their pernicious designs, both with regard to things spiritual and temporal. These apprehensions have been but too painfully realised; for thirty years and more the Jesuits have fanned the flames of civil discord throughout France; the League, which was their work, brought upon us untold miseries; and now that these are passing away, they are labouring to concentrate in their own Society the entire education of the country, and, for that purpose, to supplant and overturn the venerable University of Paris. The Sorbonne is the main bulwark of the Gallican Church, and of its ancient liberties; if the Jesuits could destroy it, they would no longer have any reason to fear the condemnation of their books and their doctrine. Their doctrine is most dangerous and execrable; according to them the Pope is absolute, not only in the government of the Church, but even in secular concerns; and kings who refuse to submit to his supremacy are so many tyrants whom God requires to be exterminated. What fatal evils have resulted from this dogma! It is this monstrous error which keeps in separation from the Church so many Christian nations, who would have no repugnance to Catholic truth were it not that they find these extravagant notions propagated as indispensable verities. So infatuated are the Jesuits on this point, that they strive to discredit and injure even the most orthodox Catholics who may decline to accept their favourite theory, and persecute them as enemies to the Church. All means and all instruments are lawful in their view, for the purpose of success; and by

their system of mental reservations they are enabled to subscribe whatever declaration may be required of them, without conceiving themselves bound to adhere to it in practice." Upon these grounds La Martelière demanded that the Jesuits should be strictly confined to the conditions laid down in their letters of re-establishment in France; that they should never be permitted, under any pretext, to impart public instruction; that they should be compelled to conform to the tradition of the Church of France, as opposed to the novel tenets which had only been invented to promote their own ascendancy.

The decision of the Court, as all had foreseen, was adverse to the Company. On the 22nd of December a decree was pronounced forbidding the Jesuits to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the education of youth within the city of Paris; and in consequence they were obliged to close the doors of their College de Clermont. The Advocate-General insisted, by way of further security, that the intrusive Fathers should subscribe a test of orthodoxy, consisting of the four following articles:—1. A General Council is superior to the Pope. 2. The Pope has no jurisdiction over the temporal power of sovereigns, and cannot deprive them of it by excommunication. 3. A priest who becomes acquainted, through the confessional, with any attempt or conspiracy against the King or the State is bound to reveal it to the civil magistrate. 4. All ecclesiastics are subjects of the King, and answerable to the secular Government.

These positions, it was of course well known, could not be honestly accepted by the Jesuits, consistently with their engagements with the Court of Rome. Montholon, the advocate for the Society, remarked, somewhat to the embarrassment of his opponents, that it would not be easy to get the four axioms in question adopted even by the Sorbonne itself; as soon as the Sorbonne had subscribed them, he engaged that the Jesuits would be willing to follow their example.* The third article, more especially, was vehemently attacked by the Papal Nuncio and Cardinal du Perron, who declared it manifestly heretical, and destructive of all religion. The wrath of the Nuncio exploded in outrageous menaces. The Pope, he threatened, would convoke a National Council to brand the teaching of

* Le Vassor, Liv. 3.

the Sorbonne as false and heretical; and in the meanwhile his Holiness would hurl the censures of the Church upon any who might venture to maintain the four propositions attempted to be imposed on the Jesuits. As for the Advocate-General Servin, he reviled him in unmeasured terms as a Huguenot, a hireling agent of the King of England, who ought to be excommunicated and stripped of his office, for attempting to sow jealousy and discord between the Holy Father and the Most Christian King.*

The Jesuits, when called on to reply to Servin's demand, stated in general terms that their statutes obliged them to conform to the rules of the Universities with which they were incorporated, and that accordingly they were ready to obey those of the University of Paris, whenever they should be enrolled among its members. This was, of course, a mere evasion. In consequence, however, of the remonstrances of Du Perron and his friends, another form of declaration was substituted; and in February, 1612, the Jesuits signed at the registry of the Parliament a document pledging them to accept the doctrine of the Sorbonne with regard to the independence and personal security of sovereigns, the maintenance of their authority, and the liberties of the Gallican Church, as recognized and observed from time immemorial. But this act, as the Abbé Racine remarks,† bound them to nothing at all, since it was done without the consent of their General; which consent, as they perfectly well knew, was essential to its validity.

The result of these proceedings was not likely to mitigate the animosity of the contending parties. The Syndic Richer, who had been the principal promoter of the appeal to the Parliament, became from that moment a man doomed to inevitable ruin by the vengeance of the Ultramontanes. Their first move was to propose a condemnation of his treatise 'De Ecclesiasticâ et Politicâ Potestate' by the Theological Faculty of the University; but this was frustrated by the prompt interposition of the Parliament, which inhibited the Sorbonne from proceeding to the examination of the work, and ordered all the copies of it to be collected and deposited in the registry of the Court.

* See a curious account of these scenes in Le Vassor, *Hist. de Louis XIII*, Liv. iii.

† Racine, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, Liv. x. p. 251.

Failing in this, the confederates carried the matter before Du Perron (as Archbishop of Sens) and his comprovincial bishops, who happened to be assembled at Paris upon other business; and here they succeeded in obtaining a censure of the obnoxious publication, as containing many statements and opinions which were "false, scandalous, and, *in their apparent sense*,* schismatical and heretical." To this sentence the prelates appended a saving clause, to the effect that they by no means intended to impugn the rights of the Crown or the "liberties of the Gallican Church." But it is not easy to perceive the exact force of this qualification, inasmuch as the whole gist of Richer's work was to defend and enforce the very rights and liberties to which they referred; so that the former could not be condemned without of necessity striking a blow (pro tanto) against the latter.

The undaunted Richer now availed himself of the legal means of self-protection which the constitution afforded him, and appealed to the Parliament "*comme d'abus*" against the Archbishop and his suffragans. But his friends among the magistrates lacked either the power or the courage to support him in this emergency. They were, probably, unwilling to hazard a direct collision with the Court, the Bishops, and the Papal See; and the result was that the letters authorizing the prosecution of the appeal were refused. Thus deserted by those in whose cause he had so manfully contended, the Syndic was compelled at length to succumb. The importunate clamour of his enemies extorted from the Regent letters patent for superseding him in his office, and electing another Syndic in his place. This was carried into execution by the Sorbonne, though not without a sharp contest among the doctors, twenty-five of whom were bold enough to vote against the resolution: and the persecuted Richer, after a masterly speech in vindication of his principles, vacated his seat, and never afterwards re-appeared at the meetings of the Faculty. He retired contentedly into solitude, where he devoted himself to learned study, and to the composition of many excellent and valuable works. These, however, were not given to the world till after his death, which took place in November, 1631.

* "*Comme elles sonnent.*"

The rancorous animosity of the Ultramontanes against Richer was not disarmed by his submission, but continued during the remainder of his life. At one time the Duke of Epéron caused him to be seized and confined in the prison of St. Victor, with the intention, it is said, of delivering him over to the tender mercies of the Inquisition at Rome. The University and the Parliament interfered, and obtained his liberation. A dark tale of personal intimidation and violence, to which he was subjected by Father Joseph, under the orders of Richelieu, is related by the Abbé Racine.* That terrible Capuchin, he states, invited Richer to dinner, and pressed him to sign a retraction of his doctrine as to the nature and limits of the Papal authority. On his declining, two ruffians rushed from behind the arras, and holding each a dagger to his breast, compelled him, under threats of instant death, to affix his signature to the required document. These sensational details must not be too easily credited. The story is found in Morisot's Letters, but the letter in which it occurs is said to be of doubtful authenticity; while Gui Patin, who from his known prejudices might be expected to confirm it, makes no mention whatever of any attempt at violence. There is no doubt, however, that Richer was induced by Father Joseph and Talon, curé of St. Gervais, to give a written explanation of his doctrine, disavowing any intention to derogate from the just authority of the Pope, and submitting his work to the Holy See, as the "infallible judge of truth." †

The Parliament, though it had been deterred by motives of political expediency from pursuing a bold course in defence of Richer, took an early opportunity of showing that its views as to the autocratic supremacy claimed by the Roman See remained unchanged. Pope Paul V., perceiving that, in spite of his repeated injunctions, the oath of allegiance still found considerable acceptance among the English Catholics, commissioned the Spanish Jesuit Suarez to write a book in support of Ultramontaniam—a service which, from his distinguished reputation, was likely to be of signal advantage to the Holy See. Suarez complied, and published, in 1613, his '*Defensio Fidei Catholicæ adversus errores Sectæ Anglicanæ; cum Respon-*

* *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, Liv. x. p. 298.

† See the *Vie du Père Joseph*, in

the *Archives Curieuses de l'Histoire de France*, 2 Série, tom. iv. Also *D'Argentré, Collect. Judic.*, tom. ii. p. 303.

sione ad Apologiam pro Juramento Fidelitatis, et ad Præfationem Monitoriam Serenissimi Jacobi Magnæ Britanniae Regis.' The work is divided into six books. In the first and second the author sets forth the divergence of the so-called Reformed Religion, as professed in England, from that of primitive antiquity and the general tradition of the Church. In the third he establishes the supreme and sole sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff in the government of the Church. In the fourth he maintains the privileges of the clergy, whom he declares to be not amenable to the jurisdiction of secular tribunals. The fifth demonstrates the falsehood and absurdity of the favourite Protestant dogma, that the Pope is Antichrist. The sixth is occupied with an examination of the oath of allegiance, which is pronounced to be irreconcilable with the faith and obligations of Catholics. James I., as soon as the work appeared, ordered it to be publicly burned by the hangman in St. Paul's Churchyard, and wrote a letter full of reproaches to Philip III. of Spain, for harbouring one guilty of such pestilent attacks upon the rights and majesty of kings. In June, 1614, the Advocate-General Servin brought this treatise under the notice of the French Parliament, and condemned it in strong language as tending to instigate criminal enterprises against the sacred persons and authority of sovereigns. The magistrates, after a brief examination, commanded the book to be torn and destroyed by the hands of the executioner—a sentence which was carried into effect the next day.

Not content with this exhibition of displeasure, the Parliament proceeded to summon to their bar four of the most eminent of the Jesuit fathers—Armand, Cotton, Fronton du Duc, and Sirmond—who, on their appearance, were sternly reprimanded by the President for having violated their engagements made two years before, and were ordered to obtain immediately from their General at Rome a renewal of his command that they should conform to the doctrine of the University of Paris as to the authority and personal security of kings. Moreover, they were required to contradict, in their public discourses, the tenets advanced by Suarez; in default of which, it was added, they would be proceeded against as traitors to the Crown, and disturbers of the public peace.*

* Le Vassor, Liv. v.

The next event of importance that claims our notice is the memorable meeting of the States-General in the year 1614.

The intrigues and dissensions of the great nobles had become a subject of grave embarrassment to the government of Mary de Medici. The Prince of Condé, first prince of the blood, had taken up an attitude of threatening opposition. On the occasion of the double matrimonial alliance with the Court of Spain, which was negociated without his knowledge or consent, he had retired from Paris, assembled his adherents, and made evident preparations for submitting his grievances to the arbitration of the sword. The Duc de Rohan, as leader of the Huguenots, took steps of the same ominous kind; and the nation seemed to be once more on the verge of a sanguinary civil strife. But at the moment when matters had apparently reached a crisis, the Court suddenly effected an accommodation with the malcontent princes at S^{te} Ménéhould, on the 15th of May, 1614; and by the first article of the treaty then concluded, the States-General were convoked to meet at Sens on the 25th of August. But the Regent and her advisers, who feared that the States, if they assembled before the young king was legally of age to assume the government, would insist on decisive measures for a change in the administration of affairs, contrived to postpone, on various pretexts, the actual opening of the session until the autumn. Louis XIII. entered on his fourteenth year, and was declared to have attained his majority, on the 27th of September, 1614. His first act of sovereignty was to intimate his pleasure that the government should continue, as before, in the hands of his mother, whom he placed at the head of the Council of State. Mary de Medici, having gained her object by this important transaction, which established her power on the most incontestable foundation, caused the deputies of the three orders to assemble in the Salle Bourbon at the Louvre, on the 27th of October.

The Ecclesiastical Chamber on this occasion was composed of one hundred and forty members, among whom were five cardinals,* seven archbishops, and forty-seven bishops. The venerable Cardinal de Joyeuse, Archbishop of Rouen and Dean of the

* These were, De Joyeuse, Du Perron, De Sourdis, François de la Rochefoucauld Bishop of Senlis, and

Louis de Lorraine Archbishop of Reims, a son of Henry Duke of Guise, who was assassinated in 1588.

Sacred College, was appointed President of the Chamber. One of the clerical delegates was Armand Jean Duplessis-Richelieu, the same who was destined in the sequel to rule France, and well-nigh Europe, under the title of the Cardinal de Richelieu. He was at this time a young man twenty-nine years of age, and held the bishopric of Lugon—a dignity which, after the lax fashion of those days, had become a sort of *apanage* in his family.

After the customary harangues addressed to the throne, in which De Marquemont, Archbishop of Lyons, officiated as orator for the clergy, the three orders proceeded to the transaction of business, the clerical deputies holding their sittings in the refectory of the Augustinian Convent.

The first measure propounded was the reception and publication of the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. The same demand had been made at several former meetings, but always with an unsuccessful result, for reasons with which the reader is already acquainted.* The present occasion, however, was judged especially favourable to a repetition of the attempt, in consequence of the unbounded devotion displayed by the Regent and her principal counsellors towards the See of Rome. The resolution was drawn up accordingly, and the Archbishop of Lyons and the Bishop of Beauvais were deputed to solicit the concurrence of the other two orders, so that it might be presented to the throne as the unanimous act of the States-General. The Chamber of Nobles, after some hesitation, gave its assent; but the Tiers-Etat was impracticable. In vain did the bishop represent that a distinct reservation was made in favour of the rights of the Crown, the franchises of the Gallican Church, and the privileges belonging to cathedral chapters, abbeys, and other religious corporations. The president, without entering on any discussion of the authority of the Council, replied in general terms that it had remained in abeyance in France for more than fifty years, and that it was by no means desirable to embarrass themselves at this moment by publicly enforcing it. Many other Councils, he observed, had never been received in France; and, nevertheless, their labours had been duly appreciated, and their directions acted upon to the advantage of the

* See chapter ii., p. 137.

Church. He proceeded to observe, with grave irony, that it lay in the power of the clergy themselves to carry into effect many of the most salutary regulations of the Council of Trent. They were quite at liberty to renounce plurality of benefices, and to correct various other abuses which the Council had condemned. This would be a course most edifying to the nation at large. The good example thus given would tend no less powerfully to the recognition of the authority of the Council than the most solemn formal publication of it. The Tiers-Etat, to conclude, thanked the clergy for their zeal for the interests of the Catholic religion, and would gladly endeavour to second their good intentions.

This was not a propitious omen for the unanimity of the three chambers in their deliberations at this important juncture. Other incidents followed, the effect of which was to aggravate their differences; and we are assured by one historian,* that such was precisely the result desired by the ministers and the Court; since, the States being manifestly unable to agree among themselves as to the measures to be recommended for the public welfare, the Queen would be left at liberty to pursue her own policy, and to defer or withhold all action upon perplexing and inconvenient subjects.

When the Chamber of the Tiers-Etat proceeded, on the 15th of December, to the consideration of its *cahier*, or general report to the sovereign, an article was inserted at the head of the document, which emphatically marks the current of feeling among the French people upon one of the most agitating topics of the day. The following is its substance:—"That, in order to arrest the course of the dangerous and seditious doctrine lately broached against sovereigns and the ruling powers ordained by God, the king be entreated to enact, as a fundamental law of the kingdom, that there exists no power on earth, temporal or spiritual, which possesses any right to deprive our monarchs of their dominions, or to absolve their subjects from the allegiance and obedience which they owe to them, upon any pretext whatsoever. That this statute be sworn to and subscribed by the deputies of the States now assembled, and henceforth by all magistrates and public officers. That all professors, public lecturers, doctors,

* Le Vassor, *Histoire de Louis XIII.*, tom. iii. Liv. v.

and preachers be enjoined to enforce and defend it. That the contrary opinion be declared impious, detestable, and wholly at variance with the state and constitution of France, which depend immediately on God alone. That all persons maintaining opposite sentiments be declared enemies to the Crown, and violators of the fundamental laws of the kingdom; and that if any foreigner, whether layman or ecclesiastic, shall publish, either by speech or writing, aught in opposition to the said enactment, the ecclesiastics of the same order domiciled in France shall be bound to contradict and refute the said publication, without ambiguity or equivocation, under pain of being prosecuted as abettors of the enemies of this realm."

There was no mistaking the animus of this proceeding. It was a direct blow against the Court of Rome, the Jesuits, and all upholders of Ultramontanism. As such, it excited an outcry of indignant alarm in the Ecclesiastical Chamber, who instantly despatched a deputation to remonstrate with the Commons for having presumed to frame an article bearing on religion without first consulting the clergy, and to request that they would at once communicate it to the other two chambers. The Tiers attempted to justify themselves by remarking that the article in question had no reference to doctrine, but was merely concerned with the restoration of discipline and the correction of abuses; but this was a transparent evasion. After much hesitation, however, the article was transmitted to the clergy and the nobles with a request for their concurrence. The clergy now entrusted the advocacy of their interests to the practised hands of Du Perron; and that veteran champion lost no time in applying all the resources of his argumentative and rhetorical skill to the difficult point at issue. On the last day of December he proceeded, in company with the Archbishops of Aix and Lyons, to the Chamber of Nobles, where he delivered an eloquent harangue three hours in length, insisting that the proposed article tended to engender jealousy and discord between the Crown of France and the Holy See, to endanger public tranquillity, and to create both intestine division among the different classes in France, and schism between the National Church and the rest of Christendom. That a sovereign might forfeit his crown through heresy or other grave delinquencies, was, he contended, a principle generally received in Catholic

countries, though it had not hitherto been recognized in France ; but at all events the question was one beyond the competence of any lay assembly, and belonged to the jurisdiction of an Œcumenical Council. The proposition of the Tiers-Etat, added the Cardinal, plainly emanated either from Saumur or from England ; and he concluded by announcing with great vehemence, that the French clergy would rather suffer martyrdom than set their hands to any such declaration as this measure attempted to impose upon them.

The appeal was successful. The nobles acknowledged the force of Du Perron's reasoning, and declared themselves ready to combine with the clerical chamber in order to procure the suppression of the article. Accordingly a numerous deputation of their order attended the Cardinal and his colleagues, when, on the 2nd of January, 1615, they made their appearance on a similar errand before the deputies of the Tiers-Etat. But here their reception was decidedly unfavourable. Du Perron exerted himself to the utmost, and in every way worthily sustained his reputation as a polemic. He represented that questions of theological doctrine and questions of ecclesiastical discipline cannot be separated from each other, and that both appertain exclusively to the province of the clergy. He fully admitted the inviolable character of the persons of sovereigns, which had been established by the Council of Constance among many others ; but suggested that opinions concerning the deposition of kings, and the power of dispensation from the oath of allegiance, stood on a different footing, and, to say the least, were doubtful and conflicting. It would, therefore, be obviously rash and unbecoming to exact a solemn adjuration from the national representatives upon speculative topics of this nature. He quoted the sentiments of the Chancellor Gerson, and of Ockham, the "invincible doctor," who, though notoriously opposed in their general teaching to Ultramontaniam, yet held that monarchs, for certain grievous crimes and misdemeanors, might justly be deposed and punished by their subjects. "There is a wide difference," urged Du Perron, "between the heathen emperors of the first centuries, and those monarchs who, in our own days, may fall into heresy or apostasy. The former had never acknowledged Jesus Christ, nor bound themselves by any engagement to live and die in the profession of the Christian religion. Whereas the latter, having expressly

declared their subjection to the King of kings, from whom they derive their sovereignty, render themselves unworthy of the crown if they rebel against Him, and violate the oath which they have taken to serve Him faithfully.”*

But all was of no avail. The Commons, by the mouth of their president, Robert Miron, replied that since, by the Cardinal's own admission, the point in dispute was “problematical,” they hoped they might without offence maintain the view which appeared to them most in accordance with the word of God; that their main object was to uphold the fundamental principle that the crown and monarchy of France are independent of the Pope; and that they did not understand how it could be deemed a grievance by any class of his Majesty's subjects to declare, under the sanction of an oath, that his throne owes no submission to ecclesiastical potentates, and that neither Pope nor Council can rightfully depose him for any cause whatever. In fine, he intimated that the Tiers-Etat could not consent to withdraw their article.

An embroilment now ensued between the different public bodies, which at one time threatened lamentable consequences. On the very day that Du Perron argued with such surpassing ability before the assembled nobles, an application was made upon the same subject to the Parliament by the Advocate-General Servin. Considering that the Court had at various times published decisions concerning the supreme authority and independence of the Crown, it was contrary to law, he contended, to re-open discussions upon a matter already determined; he therefore demanded that the several decrees referred to should be re-published, with a positive prohibition of further debates on the subject in any quarter whatever. The motion was immediately granted; and the clergy, rightly interpreting it as levelled against themselves, hastened to petition the king against the proceedings, as an infraction of the privileges of the States-General;—a step in which the Chamber of Nobles concurred. The Council of State met without delay; and after hearing a speech from the Prince of Condé,† who recommended a policy of conciliation, it was

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. xiii. p. 315.

† This speech is reported by D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 221.

resolved on the one hand to admonish the Chambers to refrain from further discussion of the points of difference that had arisen between them, and on the other, to forbid the execution of the arrêt of the Parliament. An order of Council to this effect was issued on the 7th January. Meanwhile the "*Loi fondamentale*" of the Tiers-Etat had been printed and widely circulated throughout France. Its appearance was followed by a shower of pamphlets and manifestos on both sides of the question; among the rest was one from the royal polemic James I., who manfully defended the English "oath of allegiance" against the aspersions of Cardinal du Perron.

The clergy, however, were not satisfied with this decision, although it virtually settled the matter in their favour. They required that the contested article should be expunged from the Cahier of the Tiers-Etat; and threatened that, unless this were conceded, they would close their sittings and withdraw from further participation in the proceedings of the States. The nobles supported them in this peremptory demand; and the Court finally yielded to their combined pressure. A royal message was sent to the Tiers-Etat, commanding them to remit to the king in person the article which had raised such a storm of opposition;—an order which amounted to its suppression. The chamber obeyed; the president, at the head of a deputation, waited on the king at the Louvre, and was informed that there was no need to insert the article in their official Cahier—that the king took it as already received, and would return an answer to their satisfaction. When the president made his report to the chamber, a tumultuous debate arose, and was protracted for three days, upon the question of acquiescence in this act of coercion. A numerous minority voted for resistance; but in the end a compromise was effected, and it was agreed that the article should not be maintained textually in the Cahier, but that its intended place should be distinctly reserved, with a statement that it had been presented by anticipation to the king in person, at his express command, and that his Majesty had promised to consider it favourably, and to reply to it as soon as possible.

Such was the termination of this remarkable dispute; which sets in a very instructive light the prevailing dispositions and conflicting pretensions of the three orders in the State at this

somewhat obscure period of French history. The want of confidence which reigned between the popular representatives and the privileged orders; the perplexing position of the clergy, in consequence of the exorbitant claims of the Court of Rome; the determination of the Parliament to repress every attempt on the part of a foreign ecclesiastical power to interfere in the secular concerns of the kingdom; the glaring public abuses, vehemently attacked by one party, and defended with equal pertinacity by another from motives of sordid interest; the incapacity of the constitutional legislature to exercise a wise, sustained, effective control over the government of the nation;—these are truths emphatically attested by the records of the States-General of 1614; and the lesson was no doubt clearly apprehended by sagacious and far-sighted observers at the time. With such fatal defects and disqualifications, it is not wonderful that history has but a sad tale to tell as to the influence of the States-General upon the destinies of France. No further explanation is needed of the significant fact, that for more than a century and a half the States were never again summoned for the discharge of their functions; and that when at length they were convoked in 1789, their proceedings precipitated the nation into the abyss of anarchy and revolution.

Pope Paul V. despatched briefs to the Cardinal de Joyeuse, the ecclesiastical chamber, and that of the nobles, in which, after extolling the wisdom, piety, and firmness which they had displayed in resisting the late dangerous attack on the authority of the Apostolic See, his Holiness warmly expressed his gratitude for the service they had rendered to the Church on that trying occasion.

After lengthened delays and manifold remonstrances, the Cahiers of the three chambers were finally sent in on the 23rd of February, 1615; on which day the session was closed. The budget of the clergy consisted of 302 articles, twenty-four of which were adopted in common with the Chamber of Nobles. The following were their principal recommendations:—That the decrees of Trent should be received and executed in France, as before mentioned; that the Catholic religion should be re-established in Béarn, as in all other parts of his Majesty's dominions; that the decree of the Council of Constance on the personal security of kings be re-published and enforced; that

the "*Cours Souveraines*"* be prohibited from taking cognizance of any matter affecting the faith and discipline of the Church, or the authority of the Pope in its relation to the Crown—all such questions being reserved to the jurisdiction of the king in council. They desired further, the appointment of a royal commission to define the limits within which secular courts may interfere with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction by means of the "*appel comme d'abus*;" an authoritative exposition of the much-contested "*liberties of the Gallican Church*;" the reform of the Universities; and certain changes in the composition of the Council of State. A special article was moreover inserted in favour of the Jesuits; in recognition of whose "*continual and important services to the Church*," the king was requested to license them to teach publicly in the Collège de Clermont, as well as in all provincial towns which might express a desire for their instructions. A last attempt was made to obtain the concurrence of the Tiers-Etat in the clauses relating to the Council of Trent and the Jesuits; but without success.

At the audience of prorogation at the Louvre, the Bishop of Luçon (Richelieu) made his appearance as orator for the clergy; and the harangue which he delivered on this occasion, apparently his earliest public effort, left the impression on his auditory that he possessed political genius of first-rate order, and could not fail, sooner or later, to attain a towering ascendancy both in Church and State. It is curious to observe that the future minister grounded this discourse upon one predominant idea or principle—the necessity of restoring to the clergy the active share in the management of public affairs which they had enjoyed from the earliest ages of civilization. The times, he said, when his Majesty's predecessors had employed the prelates of the kingdom in the concerns of State were those in which the Gallican Church had flourished in its greatest glory. Since that practice had been discontinued, the clerical order had degenerated to such an extent that its ancient character was no longer to be recognized. It seemed now to be imagined that, because bishops were consecrated to the service of the

* The "*cours souveraines*" were the Parliaments of Paris and the provinces, the Grand Conseil, the Cour des Aides, the Chambre des Comptes, and the Cour des Monnaies. They

were so named because they were (theoretically and constitutionally) independent, and not subject to the revision of any superior tribunal.

King of kings, they were incapable of rendering effective service to their earthly sovereign. "More than this," continued the prelate, "although the clergy offer to their sovereign what every other Christian offers to God, namely, the tenth part of their property, attempts are constantly made to deprive them of all the rest, and that in favour of persons who cannot lawfully possess it, being either laymen or avowed separatists from the Church. Is it not plainly contrary to justice to give to the world that which belongs to God, instead of sacrificing to God that which appertains to the world? It may seem perhaps but a small thing to present a layman or a sectary to an abbey, but when it is considered that the patronage of the greater part of the parochial cures in France is annexed to the abbeys, it becomes clear that this is the principal cause of the corruptions and disorders which afflict the Church. A mere courtier is not likely to nominate devout and holy pastors, and an enemy to our faith will be only too glad to do it an injury by preferring men of ignorant minds and disreputable life. Sire, this is a grave abuse; an abuse that entails the ruin of innumerable souls, for the loss of whom you yourself must one day answer before the tribunal of God." Proceeding next to touch on the "*appels comme d'abus*," Richelieu cites the canons of Councils, the testimonies of primitive Fathers, and the decrees of Christian emperors, such as Constantine and Charlemagne, to prove that ecclesiastical jurisdiction cannot lawfully be exercised by any but ecclesiastical judges. "All good sovereigns," he urged, "have been scrupulously careful to maintain the spouse of Christ in the enjoyment of her proper authority; and your Majesty will observe that this is a duty incumbent upon monarchs, not only as a point of conscience, but also for their personal interests; since it is certain that a prince cannot more effectually teach his subjects to despise *his own* authority, than by permitting them to encroach upon that of God, from whom he holds his crown." *

After an earnest appeal on behalf of the publication of the Council of Trent, Richelieu concludes by eulogising the young king's wisdom in delegating the chief authority of government to the queen-mother. He exhorts him to persevere in this line

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. xiii. p. 395 *et seqq.*

of policy, and to "add to the title of Mother of the King, that of Mother of the Kingdom." This was a dexterous stroke for the advancement of his own fortunes. Attaching himself to the party of Mary de Medici and the Maréchal d'Ancre, Richelieu now rose rapidly to power. His first court appointment was that of private chaplain to the young queen consort, Anne of Austria. In November, 1616, he was named a member of the Council of State, and Secretary of State for War and Foreign Affairs.

Disappointed on this, as on so many former occasions, of obtaining satisfaction from the Government with regard to the publication of the Tridentine decrees, the clergy resolved to take measures to that end among themselves, so far as it lay in their power, independently of the civil authority. The prelates held a meeting immediately after the dismissal of the States-General, and entered into a solemn engagement to observe the canons and ordinances of the Council, and to enforce their execution to the utmost of their power throughout their dioceses. It was further agreed that provincial Councils and diocesan synods should be convoked during the year ensuing, in order that the measure might be adopted throughout the kingdom in due canonical form. The episcopal manifesto bore the signatures of three cardinals (La Rochefoucauld, Du Perron, and De Gondi), seven archbishops, forty-five bishops, and thirty other dignitaries. The step, however, was not allowed to pass unchallenged by the watchful guardians of the civil jurisdiction. An order was issued by the *Prévôt* of Paris,* forbidding all ecclesiastics to make publication of the Tridentine decrees as if officially received, or to introduce any change whatever in matters of church discipline without the king's permission, under pain of forfeiting their temporalities. The Huguenots also raised a violent clamour against the publication of the Council; and the prince of Condé, who had lately allied himself with them in consequence of a fresh misunderstanding with the court, expressly stipulated, in making terms with the Government, that this demand of the bishops should not be carried into

* The *Prévôt* of Paris was the head of the metropolitan police, his office answering very nearly to that of the "*Préfet de Police*" of modern times.

He presided as judge in a court which held its sittings at the *Châtelet*. His jurisdiction comprised the city of Paris and the "*Isle de France*."

effect. By an article of the treaty of Loudun (May 3, 1616), the king declared that no steps had been taken by authority for the recognition of the Council; and that it would remain, with regard to France, in the same position as heretofore.* Under these circumstances, the prelates judged it inexpedient to hold the provincial Councils which had been agreed upon at the meeting at Paris, since a pretext might thus have been afforded for fresh disturbances on the part of the separatists and the disaffected princes. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, however, assembled his clergy at a diocesan synod at Senlis in October, 1620, when it was resolved that the Council should be received and observed in that diocese, not only touching matters of faith, but also in its decrees concerning the Sacraments of orders, penance, and marriage, the residence of the clergy, the rules of admission into conventual houses, and other important points of discipline. Similar measures were adopted by a provincial council held at Bordeaux under the presidency of Cardinal de Sourdis in 1624; and regulations of the same nature were made by several other bishops for the guidance of their own clergy. In this manner the greater part of the Tridentine constitutions were gradually received, in an indirect and informal way; but every effort to get the decrees incorporated with the body of national statute law was firmly and successfully resisted by the civil power.

The slumbering controversy concerning the government of the Church and the supremacy of the Pope was revived in 1617 by the appearance of a work by Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, the first volume of which was published that year in London.

De Dominis was a man of great natural capacity, and, having studied for many years in early life under the Jesuits, had acquired a considerable store of learning. His temper of mind, however, was singularly vacillating; he forsook the Jesuits, made interest for preferment in the Church, and obtained the archbishopric of Spalatro, the capital of Dalmatia. He now became involved in the affair of the Interdict of

* The famous article of the *Tiers-Etat* on the independence of the Crown was at first inserted as one of the conditions of this treaty; but Condé was induced to abandon it at the

urgent instance of the Capucin father Joseph. See the details of this intrigue in the *Vie du Père Josef*, in *Arch. Cur. de l'Hist. de France*, 2 Serie, tom. iv.

Venice; and stood forward conspicuously in defence of the Republic against the oppression of the Court of Rome. The Inquisition naturally passed a sentence of condemnation on his writings: and this censure irritated and disgusted the archbishop to such a degree that he quitted his see and retired into England, as a place of refuge where he might publish his sentiments without fear of persecution. James I., attracted by his professions of admiration for the Anglican Church, and credulously accepting him as a genuine convert from the errors of Rome, showed him flattering attentions, and preferred him to the Mastership of the Savoy and the Deanery of Windsor. Thus protected, De Dominis put forth his treatise '*De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*,' which is based mainly on the same principles which had been so powerfully advocated by the two Barclays and Edmond Richer, but at the same time differs from them in some notable particulars. De Dominis entirely denies the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff as the vicar of Jesus Christ; according to him, the Church is not a monarchy but an oligarchy,—the authority of government being exercised coordinately by all members of the episcopate. And even the bishops do not derive from their consecration any direct and exclusive authority from God; consecration is no more than a ceremony through which they become qualified to exercise ministerially that power which is vested of right in the whole Christian society, laity as well as clergy. From these positions he argues that the Papacy, with all its lofty prerogatives, is simply anti-Catholic and antichristian. Nicolas Isambert, syndic of the Sorbonne, impeached the book before the Faculty at Paris on the 30th of October, pointing out its peculiarly insidious and dangerous tendency, inasmuch as the author gave out that his views were identical with those maintained by the University of Paris. After a series of animated debates, a list of propositions extracted from the work was condemned by a majority of the doctors; but a strong minority protested against the decision. The ex-syndic Richer was earnestly entreated by his friends to come forth on this occasion from his retirement, and, by participating in the vote of his colleagues, to refute the imputations of heterodoxy under which he had laboured for the last five years. He yielded only so far as to draw up some notes upon the sentence of the Sorbonne when it was published,

from which it appeared that he could but partially concur in the conclusions of his brethren on the questions in debate. The *second* proposition of De Dominis, for instance, which asserted that the Church possesses no secular jurisdiction, no coercive power or right of external constraint, was pronounced by the doctors heretical, subversive of hierarchical authority, and tending to produce confusion in the Church. Richer was unable to accept this language, which he considered overstrained and unjustifiable,—a feeling which was strongly shared by the Advocate-General Servin.

The subsequent career of De Dominis was painfully ignoble and humiliating. After residing several years in England, he seems to have grown dissatisfied with the Reformed communion; and, through the medium of the Spanish ambassador in London, he effected a reconciliation with the See of Rome. Being thereupon deprived of his English preferments, he returned to the continent; and, with his characteristic inconstancy, began to write in a violent strain against the Church which had sheltered and befriended him in the hour of adversity. But his turbulent spirit was incapable of repose. On reaching Rome he retracted in unqualified terms the errors and mistaken reasonings with which he confessed that his works abounded, and professed abject submission to the judgment of the supreme Pontiff. Before a year had passed, it was discovered, from an intercepted correspondence with friends in England, that he already repented of his repentance, and was engaged in intrigues contrary to the Papal interests. Upon this he was arrested and imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo, where within a very brief space he once more declared himself a convert to the Romish faith. He was not, however, restored to liberty, but died in confinement, after receiving the Sacraments of the Church, in December, 1625. To complete this grotesque history, it must be mentioned that after death the unfortunate De Dominis was treated as a relapsed heretic, in which state, notwithstanding his affected penitence, he was deemed to have expired. His corpse was publicly burned to ashes, and his works shared the same fate.*

* Ellies-Dupin, *Hist. Eccles. du XVII. Siècle*. D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.* tom. i. p. 250.

CHAPTER VII.

OF all the recommendations of the clergy at the States-General of 1615, only two were carried into effect by the Crown. These were the reinstatement of the Jesuits as public teachers, and the restoration of the Church establishment in Béarn. By a royal Ordonnance of February 15, 1618, the Jesuit fathers were authorized to re-open their college at Paris (the Collège de Clermont) for the delivery of lectures in the sciences and other branches of knowledge; and the Parliament was forbidden to entertain any appeal against this measure. The University accordingly forbore to appeal; but nevertheless proceeded to draw up a series of stringent regulations with a view to exclude the Jesuits from degrees and other privileges of the corporation. These provisions were summarily cancelled by an order of the Council of State.

Father Cotton, who ever since the restoration of the Jesuits had occupied the post of royal confessor, and had exercised a weighty influence both political and ecclesiastical, was removed from office in 1617, on the occasion of the rupture between Louis and the Queen Mother. His place was supplied by another member of the order, Father Arnoux, a man of at least equal ability, but of a bigoted and violent temper, who, in conjunction with the new favourite De Luynes, soon acquired a paramount ascendancy over the feeble mind of Louis. Urged by their importunities, the king determined, in the summer of 1617, on taking immediate steps for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in the Principality of Béarn, and restoring to the Church the property which had been confiscated for the benefit of the Calvinists by Jeanne d'Albret some fifty years before.* This point had been strenuously insisted on by the clergy ever since the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, of which indeed it formed one of the principal stipulations.

* By an edict of October 31, 1571.

Henry IV. had made several attempts to satisfy them ;* but he was embarrassed by habitual respect for the “fors,”† or constitutional liberties, of his native country, by one of which it was unlawful for the sovereign to annul anything that had once been enacted by the States of Béarn. Louis XIII. was very differently situated from his father, and entertained no such scruples. He was deeply attached to the Catholic faith ; and the daily representations made to him by those nearest his person convinced him that it was his duty no longer to tolerate the existing state of things in that part of his dominions. An Order of Council, dated June 25, 1617, directed that the exercise of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion should be resumed and maintained throughout the province of Béarn, and that the Catholic clergy should be put into possession of the temporalities ; due provision being made at the same time for the ejected Protestant ministers, by a grant from the revenues of the Crown equal in amount to the emoluments which they surrendered. This mandate was received by the Béarnois with a general outburst of indignant opposition. The States assembled hastily, and declared that their immemorial rights and privileges had been violated. The Huguenots remonstrated at a great meeting of their preachers and deputies at Orthez ; the Conseil souverain of Pau declined to register the edict ; and such was the agitation that prevailed, that rebellion and civil war once more appeared imminent. De Luynes and the ultra-catholic party in the Council urged Louis to proceed to extremities against the exasperated Protestants ; but the course of events in other quarters determined him for the present to an opposite policy. The movements of the Queen Mother Mary de Medici, who had been exiled from court at the time of the assassination of the Maréchal d'Ancre in 1617, were such as to create considerable anxiety. The disaffected grandes—the Dukes of Epemon, Guise, and Mayenne, the Maréchal de Bouillon, and others—had flocked around her in her retirement at Blois, and were intriguing with eager animosity against the government.

* By an edict of 1599 Henry established in some measure a Catholic organization in Béarn, appointing bishops at Lescar and Oléron, with fixed salaries, and permission to re-

deem the ancient estates belonging to their sees.

† The same word with the well-known “fueros” of the Basque provinces of Spain.

On the night of the 22nd of February, 1619, Mary contrived, with the assistance of Epernon, to escape from the chateau of Blois, and fled to Angoulême,* where, supported by the factious nobles and their retainers, she occupied a formidable position. In this posture of affairs the Court deemed it wiser to postpone coercive measures against the Protestants of Béarn; the more so, inasmuch as the Huguenot leaders forbore at this conjuncture to embarrass the Government by openly taking part with the malcontents of Angoulême. Accordingly they received permission to hold a general assembly of their co-religionists at Loudun, in September of this year, for the purpose of preparing and presenting to the Crown a formal statement of their grievances. This synod, however, proved even more excited and turbulent than that at Orthez. It was demanded of the king, as a preliminary article to the general cahier, that the edict of restitution should be unconditionally withdrawn. So critical was the state of parties, that the Government durst not return a direct negative to this requisition; and, after much temporising and hesitation, a sort of compromise was entered into with the Protestant deputies at Loudun, through the intervention of the Prince de Condé and the Duc de Lesdiguières. In the mean time strenuous efforts were made to bring about a good understanding between Louis and his mother, and thus to frustrate the cabals of her party. Cardinal de Bérulle, who among his other talents was known to be a skilful diplomatist, was despatched to Angoulême to ascertain the queen's dispositions, and pave the way towards a reconciliation. Recourse was also had to the Bishop of Luçon,† who was recalled from his banishment at Avignon and sent on the same errand to the temporary residence of his royal mistress. With considerable difficulty the terms of accommodation were at length agreed on. Mary recovered her independence, and obtained for herself the government of Anjou, together with lavish promises of honours and appointments for her friends; after which an interview took place between the king and his mother at Tours, and peace was apparently sealed.

* The Duke of Epernon was Governor of the province of Angoumois.

† At the suggestion of the Capuchin monk Joseph du Tremblay. This service was never forgotten by Riche-

lieu. Father Joseph was one of the chief agents in this negociation with the queen. (*Arch. Cur. de l'Hist. de France*, 2 Serie, tom. iv.)

But the bad faith of De Luynes, who neglected to fulfil several of the most important stipulations of the treaty, soon produced a fresh train of discontents; and a far more alarming confederacy was organized, which the Government found itself compelled to encounter by force. The hostilities were of brief duration, and in August, 1620, the insurgents were reduced to submission. The conditions granted to them were nearly identical with those of the year preceding; but Richelieu succeeded in carrying certain points of special advantage to himself, one of them being a promise from the king to recommend him to the Pope for promotion to the rank of Cardinal.

Matters being thus pacifically settled in the North, Louis turned his attention to the subjugation of the refractory Béarnais. He had now a powerful body of troops under arms; with these he marched to Bordeaux, and for the last time summoned the authorities at Pau to register the edict of "main-levée" in favour of the Catholic clergy. They remained obstinate in their refusal; whereupon the king, exclaiming, "Il faut aller à eux!" took the road to Béarn at the head of his army. At these tidings the terrified magistrates hastily registered the edict; but it was now too late. Louis arrived next day within sight of Pau. His attendants desired instructions as to the ceremonial to be observed on his entrance; he replied that he would proceed first of all to the church, if there were any in the place, and if not, he would make his entry without any pomp or state at all, since it would ill become him to receive the honours of royalty in a spot where he had no means of offering his homage to God, from whom he held his dominions.* On the 15th of October, 1620, Louis traversed the streets of Pau and took up his quarters at the ancient chateau, amid the sullen silence of the inhabitants. On the 17th he repaired to Navarreins, the strongest fortress in the province, where he superseded the Protestant governor and replaced him by a Catholic; he also caused mass to be celebrated in his presence, for the first time since the Catholic ritual had been abolished half a century before. Returning next day to Pau, Louis presided personally at the execution of his edicts for the re-establishment of the Church as it existed before the so-called Reformation. The churches

* *Mercuré François*, tom. vi. p. 350.

were restored to the Catholics; the bishops and abbots of Béarn recovered their ancient privileges, their seats in the provincial legislature, their lands and other endowments; the alienated tithes were resumed by the parochial clergy. Finally, the "pays souverain" of Béarn, together with its dependencies of Basse Navarre, Andorre, and Donezan, were declared for ever re-united and incorporated with the crown and royal "domaine" of France. In consequence of this annexation, a new provincial parliament was instituted at Pau, of which Pierre de Marca, afterwards the eminent controversialist and Archbishop of Toulouse, was appointed the first President. De Marca, though at this time a young man of only six-and-twenty, was already thoroughly well versed in ecclesiastical law and Catholic antiquity. He now eagerly engaged in conferences with the Protestants of Béarn, and succeeded in effecting some remarkable conversions to the Church. The exertions of Father Joseph were rewarded by similar results. Father Cotton, too, was encouraged by the late revolution of affairs to undertake a journey to Pau, where he established a Jesuit college, and was instrumental in many other measures tending to the strengthening and consolidation of Catholic interests.

The vigorous exhibition of despotic authority in the case of Béarn threw the Protestants throughout the kingdom into a state of extraordinary irritation. A general assembly was convoked at La Rochelle, the capital of French Calvinism, in December, 1620, contrary to the commands of the king, and even to the advice of Duplessis-Mornay, and other chiefs of the party. Inflammatory harangues were made, and violent counsels prevailed. A memorial of grievances was adopted, which the king refused to receive unless the synod were first dissolved; the deputies, on their part, protested that they would not separate until they had obtained satisfaction. Convinced, by the concurrence of various causes, that another crisis was at hand in their struggle with the Ancient Church, the Reformers now made preparations for an armed insurrection. The assembly of La Rochelle declared itself *en permanence*, and issued a manifesto by which the whole country was parcelled out into eight circles or military governments. These were placed under the command of the great Huguenot nobles—the dukes of Rohan, Soubise, La Tremoille, and Chatillon, the Marquis de la Force,

and the veteran Marshal Lesdiguières; the direction of the whole being entrusted to the Duke of Bouillon. But this organization was more formidable on paper than in reality; much division of opinion existed among the nominal commanders as to the wisdom and policy of the hostile movement. Bouillon declined the post of generalissimo, and remained neutral in his fortress of Sédan. Lesdiguières, who was already more than half a Catholic, not only refused his services to the Huguenots, but accepted a principal command in the royal army. The Duke of La Tremoille, a relative of Bouillon, followed the example of his uncle;—a course which was expressly recommended to him, according to one account, by Duplessis-Mornay himself.* In short, it is manifest that the enterprise of the Protestants on this occasion was unwise, precipitate, and unjustifiable. Even admitting that they had good ground for complaining of systematic infractions of the Edict of Nantes, and other acts of oppression, their own interests would have been far better served at this moment by patience and moderation than by breaking out into open revolt. Stimulated by the example of their brethren in Germany, who, under the leadership of the Elector Palatine, were desperately braving the whole strength of the Empire, the Huguenots assumed an attitude which almost compelled Louis to proceed to extremities against them as rebels and traitors. This was playing the game of their enemies. The Jesuits, and other zealots who possessed the ear of Louis, easily persuaded him that the time was come when he must vindicate his authority, once for all, against those who thus made religion a stalking-horse for disloyalty and armed rebellion. In point of fact, both the rising of the Huguenots, and the decisive measures of the court for its suppression, resulted from the manœuvres of that great party which was labouring, at any cost, and often by indefensible means, to restore the supremacy of the Catholic Church throughout Europe.

As I do not profess to write the history of the Calvinist Separatists, nor to describe secular transactions except so far as they directly bear upon the fortunes of the Church, the reader will not expect from me more than a very slight outline of the

* Le Vassor, *Hist. de Louis XIII.*, Liv. xvii.

events of the two campaigns of Louis XIII. in the war of 1621 and 1622.

The king set out from Fontainebleau on the 29th of April, 1621, attended by the Duc de Luynes, who had just previously been advanced to the dignity of Constable of France. His march towards the disturbed districts was preceded by a proclamation, in which he assured the Huguenots that he was fully resolved to observe all the edicts issued in their favour both by his father and himself, and declared that, while rebels with arms in their hands would henceforth be treated as such, he took specially under his royal protection all of the reformed persuasion who should remain faithful in their allegiance to their sovereign. This was language well calculated to increase the symptoms of disunion which had already begun to manifest themselves among the ranks of the insurgents.

The first Huguenot town of which Louis took possession was Saumur, where Duplessis-Mornay, who had held the post of governor for upwards of thirty years, was deprived of his command under a promise to restore it within three months, which was never fulfilled. The Duke of Soubise retired before the royal army, and the districts bordering on the Loire, together with the whole of Poitou, submitted without resistance. St. Jean d'Angély was taken after a siege of three weeks, and lenient terms were granted to the inhabitants; the fortifications, however, were dismantled, and the town forfeited its municipal charter and other privileges. The towns of Guienne were reduced with little difficulty, with the exception of Clérac on the Lot, which was vigorously defended for twelve days. Here Louis ordered the public execution of four Protestants, one of them a minister, who had distinguished themselves by fomenting the revolt. But, on proceeding to lay siege to Montauban, the principal fortress of the Huguenots in the south, the royal forces experienced a decided check. The place was admirably defended by the Marquis de la Force and the Duke of Rohan, and three months were consumed in ineffectual efforts to subdue it.* At length the ablest officers among the

* The noted Huguenot minister Chamier, the same who was employed in drawing up the Edict of Nantes, contributed greatly to the successful resistance

royalists pronounced it hopeless to persist, and Louis was compelled ignominiously to raise the siege. The Constable de Luynes, to whose incompetence this misfortune was in great measure attributed, shortly afterwards fell ill of a contagious disorder prevalent in the camp, which carried him off in a few days. The campaign now terminated, and the king returned to Paris in January.

The repulse of the royal arms before Montauban had the natural effect of encouraging the hopes and inflaming the fanatical ardour of the Huguenots. A general rising followed in Languedoc, the Cevennes, and Provence, and was marked by outrageous excesses on the part of the sectaries against the dominant religion. At Montpellier, the cathedral and every other Catholic church in the city was pillaged and destroyed; the clergy were driven away with violence and insult, and the excellent bishop, Pierre Fenouillet, made his escape at the imminent peril of his life. Similar acts of profanation were perpetrated throughout the district; many of the most beautiful specimens of the architectural taste of the middle ages perished under the hands of these ruthless Reformers.

Early in the spring of 1622 the Rochellois fitted out a considerable fleet of privateers, with which they blockaded the western coast, and the embouchures of the Loire and the Gironde, and committed great depredations on maritime commerce. The Duke of Soubise, at the same time, recommenced warlike operations in Poitou, and overran the country up to the gates of Nantes. On the 20th of March, 1622, the king once more took the field, and marched against Soubise. He attacked him at the Ile de Rié on the 15th of April, and inflicted on him a total and decisive defeat, his loss amounting to upwards of four thousand men. Flushed with victory, Louis now traversed without resistance the whole of Poitou and Saintonge, and, on entering Guienne, received the submission of two of the most distinguished Huguenot generals—the Marquises of La Force and Chatillon. They were not only pardoned unconditionally, but were presented besides with the baton of marshal. Some examples of severe reprisal were made, however, in the course

of Montauban. He was killed by a cannon-shot on the ramparts of the town while in the act of encouraging the soldiers.

of the royal progress; the little town of Négrepélisse in Quercy, where a detachment of the king's troops had been put to the sword during the winter, was sacked, and the entire population was indiscriminately butchered.

It was during the summer of 1622 that the aged Marshal Lesdiguières made his abjuration of Calvinism in the cathedral of Grenoble, and was received into the Catholic Church by the Archbishop of Embrun. Although the defection of such a personage was, doubtless, a mortifying blow to the Protestants, it can hardly have occasioned surprise. Throughout life Lesdiguières had been a lukewarm Huguenot; and it was well known that of late years he had become entirely alienated from the creed of the Reformers, and ready on the first favourable opportunity to renounce it openly. It was a suspicious circumstance, no doubt, that the marshal, on the very day of his recantation, received from the king the Constable's sword, which had for years been the object of his ambition. This, not unnaturally, exposed him to a storm of sarcastic reproaches from the party which he abandoned; his appointment was, in their view, the wages of apostasy—the thirty pieces of silver for which Judas sold his Lord. It must, however, in justice be remembered that Lesdiguières had made up his mind to the step which he finally adopted for a considerable period before he thus attained the highest dignity of his profession. It appears that his first impressions in favour of Catholicism were due to the powerful reasonings and exhortations of Father Cotton, whose sermons he continued to attend at different intervals for twenty years. He had also frequented the ministrations of S. François de Sales, when on two successive occasions, in the years 1617 and 1618, he preached during Lent at Grenoble; and had repeatedly sought instruction from that great prelate in private. The real reason why Lesdiguières neglected for so many years to obey the dictates of his conscience was an immoral connexion, which he lacked the firmness and courage to break off. His mistress, Marie Vignon, became his wife after the death of his first duchess; and the only obstacle to his reconciliation with the Church being thus removed, he lost no time in carrying out his long-formed purpose.

Unquestionably Lesdiguières was not superior to the common weaknesses of humanity, and ambition was one of his besetting

infirmities; but it would be unfair to attribute his conversion solely to motives of this sordid kind. So far as can be ascertained, his rejection of the doctrines of Luther and Calvin was sincere; and he seems to have returned with implicit confidence and satisfaction to the Church of his forefathers. Lesdiguières died at the age of eighty-four, in September, 1626.

Towards the end of August the royal army commenced the siege of Montpellier, which resisted for several weeks. But, meanwhile, negotiations were proceeding between the Duke of Rohan and the Constable Lesdiguières. Manifold difficulties presented themselves, which were at length overcome, and on the 19th of October it was announced that peace had been definitively concluded. By the treaty of Montpellier a general amnesty was granted, and the king again confirmed the Edict of Nantes in its full extent; but, at the same time, the terms imposed upon the Huguenots were sufficiently humiliating. Their cautionary towns were forfeited, with the exception of La Rochelle and Montauban; Montpellier was to be dismantled, and its municipal officers henceforth nominated by the Crown; all new fortifications raised by the Huguenots were to be demolished; and though they were still permitted to retain their synods and "colloquies" for purely religious matters, they were interdicted from holding meetings for *political* purposes without the king's permission, under the penalties of high treason.

Thus this ill-advised movement enabled the Government to attack with fatal effect the material guarantees which the Calvinists had extorted by former successes, and by means of which they had rendered themselves so dangerous to the independence of the State. After this, their extinction as a political party was merely a question of time. A change of administration was at hand, which boded ominously for their interests. The anomaly of an *imperium in imperio*—a rival power established side by side with the monarchical authority, and possessing its own instruments of independent action—was wholly irreconcilable with the principles and genius of Richelieu. That great statesman accordingly made it his primary object, on succeeding to the helm of affairs, to put an end to the abnormal position occupied by the Huguenots, and to reduce them to the harmless level of a tolerated sect. It followed from this policy, that the Gallican Church recovered its legitimate status as the

sole authorized teacher of the nation ; though at the same time Richelieu discouraged religious persecution, and respected, for the most part, the individual rights of conscience.

An interval of more than two years elapsed after the death of the Constable de Luynes before the accession of Richelieu to supreme authority. His elevation to the Conclave took place on the 5th of September, 1622 ; having been long delayed by the jealousy of De Luynes, and by the personal antipathy with which he was regarded by the king. At this moment the persons who enjoyed the greatest influence at court were the Comte de Schomberg, superintendent of finance, the Marquis de Puisieux, Secretary of State, Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, and Marshal Bassompierre. They were all men of inferior ability, but they were closely united by one common object, namely, that of excluding the new cardinal from any share in the administration. Richelieu, although at this juncture he affected great moderation, and even sought to excuse himself, on the score of weak health, from engaging in any public employment,* was well known to possess unbounded ambition, consummate talent, and inflexible steadfastness of purpose. The ministers, conscious of their own weakness, foresaw that if the doors of the council chamber were once more opened to him, the cardinal would eclipse all competitors, and monopolise the government. Nevertheless the force of circumstances, and the imperative requirements of the public interest, prevailed eventually against these hostile intrigues. The incapacity of his present advisers became manifest to Louis, who was by no means deficient in intelligence, though too timid to rely on the resources of his own mind in the great task of government. The Secretary Puisieux was dismissed in January, 1624, and his disgrace was shared by his father, the Chancellor de Sillery. Schomberg had been previously deprived of office ; and the chief authority now passed into the hands of the Marquis de la Vieuville, Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld continuing to act as the nominal President of the Council. Vieuville found it necessary to strengthen his position by obtaining the support of the Queen Mother, who since her last reconciliation with Louis had again become a person of considerable importance. Mary made it a

* F. Griffet, *Hist. du Règne de Louis XIII.*, tom. i. p. 414.

condition of her adhesion that her confidant Richelieu should be introduced into the royal council. Vieuville assented, and accordingly recommended the measure to the king. Louis, who had accurately divined the Cardinal's character, resisted for several weeks all solicitations in his favour. At length he yielded, contrary to his private inclination, but in accordance, we may well believe, with his sense both of duty and of interest on public grounds. On the 26th of April, 1624, the Cardinal took his seat for the second time as a member of the Council of State; a place which he had the address to retain, without any serious vicissitudes of fortune or diminution of influence, throughout his life. He immediately resigned his bishopric of Luçon, feeling that he could no longer fulfil the obligation of residence; and his successor in the see was consecrated in June, 1624. From the first moment, the master spirit of the new minister asserted its supremacy, and Louis ere long resigned himself to his inevitable dominion. Richelieu inaugurated his reign by claiming for himself, as a prince of the Church, the right of precedence over all the great officers of the Crown, and over all other members of the Council except the princes of the blood royal. Vieuville, having served the Cardinal's purposes, was driven from office on the first pretext, and was imprisoned in the chateau of Amboise; and Richelieu at once succeeded to the undisputed control of the vessel of the State.

It soon appeared that the Huguenots had gained no accession of wisdom by the failure of their recent insurrection. Several of the provisions of the treaty of Montpellier had been evaded by the Crown. Fort Louis, a royal garrison which menaced La Rochelle, had not been demolished according to promise. Obstacles had been thrown in the way of the meeting of the reformed synods and consistories; the civil privileges guaranteed by the Edict of Nantes had been violated by the provincial authorities; cases of gross partiality and injustice had occurred in the administration of the law by the parliament. On these grounds the sectaries hazarded another revolt in 1625, at a moment when large bodies of the king's troops had been despatched on foreign expeditions. The enterprise was conducted by the two brothers Rohan and Soubise with their usual gallantry, the former commanding by land, the latter by sea. The details of the operations belong to the civil history of the

time. Soubise obtained some successes, but suffered a total defeat off the Isle of Rhè, with the loss of almost his whole fleet; after which the general assembly of the Protestants sent deputies to treat with the Government for conditions of peace. The king expressed himself willing to grant terms of reconciliation to the Protestants of Languedoc, but was not disposed to extend his clemency to those inveterate rebels the Rochellois. The deputies represented that it was essential to include in any pacific arrangement both La Rochelle and the Duke of Soubise, whom they entitled "grand Admiral of the Protestant churches." This point was at length conceded through the influence of Richelieu, who felt that, in order to carry out successfully his schemes of foreign policy, it was absolutely necessary to gain a respite from the treasonable agitation which distracted France at home. He persuaded Louis, therefore, to grant peace once more to his Protestant subjects without exception; and that upon more favourable terms than they had any just reason to expect. They were left in possession of most of their former privileges; and the king, though he declined to dismantle Fort Louis, engaged that, so long as the citizens of La Rochelle behaved peaceably and loyally, their commerce should not be in any way obstructed by the royal garrison. A special commissioner was to reside at La Rochelle during the king's pleasure to superintend the execution of the articles of the treaty.

The motives of Richelieu in dealing thus leniently with the heretics were misunderstood, or purposely misrepresented, by zealous Catholics both at home and abroad. "My design," replied the Cardinal to the remonstrances of the Papal nuncio Spada, "is to crush the Huguenots completely and for ever; but before doing so, I shall be compelled to scandalise the world once more.* Just now they are reviling me at Rome as a heretic; the day will come when they will be more ready to canonise me as a saint." He had already astonished Europe by siding with the Protestants of the Grisons against the House of Austria, and even against the forces of the Pope himself; and by superficial or prejudiced observers the present pacification with the Rochellois was viewed as a repetition of the same

* Le Vassor, Liv. xxii.

strange policy. When the treaty was signed, on the 5th of February, 1626, Richelieu, accompanied by his colleague Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, retired from the council chamber, in order to avoid the appearance of participating in an act of grace to heretics. But in spite of this precaution, the ultra-Catholic bigots assailed the minister with every kind of libellous vituperation; he was held up to ridicule as "the Cardinal of La Rochelle," "the patriarch of the Atheists," "the Calvinist Pontiff." Two of the satires launched against his seemingly anti-Catholic proceedings on this occasion were of so dangerous a tendency, that the cardinal deemed it necessary to bring them under the notice of the Assembly of the clergy then in session at Paris. They were anonymous publications, of which the first was entitled '*Mysteria politica*;' the second, '*Admonitio ad regem Christianissimum Ludovicum XIII.*' They were printed in Italy, and were attributed to the Jesuits Eudæmon-Jean, Garasse, and Keller. "The King of France," the author asserted, "was inconsistent with himself; with one hand he made war upon the heretics at home, while with the other he supported them against the Catholics abroad. He had succoured the States General of Holland; he was helping to reinstate a heretic Elector lawfully deprived of his dignity; he had leagued himself with the Protestants of the Grisons against the Catholics of the Valteline." The pamphleteers proceeded to discuss in detail various questions of a grossly seditious character; for example, whether it was not the duty of the States-General of France to point out to the king that his alliances with heretics were unbecoming and criminal; whether Louis had not by such conduct incurred the penalty of excommunication; whether his evil advisers are not equally liable to ecclesiastical censure; whether the king ought not to be restrained by force from scandalising the Christian world by making war upon Catholics; whether, under the present circumstances of the kingdom, it was not the duty of Frenchmen to elect a prince capable of effectually defending the Catholic religion, and if so, where such a prince was to be found. In conclusion, the king was denounced as an enemy of the Church, against whom the Pope ought forthwith to unsheath the sword of St. Peter, and thus authorize other princes to declare war against him in the common cause of Christendom. "God had

permitted his father Henry IV. to be assassinated, as a punishment for having attempted to put two heretic princes into possession of the duchies of Cleves and Juliers. The cause which the House of Austria had espoused in this quarrel was none other than the cause of God himself. To make war upon sovereigns who were defending the Catholic religion was to act in open opposition to the Divine will,—to “fight against God.” Every page of the work abounded with virulent abuse of Richelieu, as the firebrand of Europe, the projector of the “English marriage,” and the author of the unnatural league between France and anti-Catholic powers.

These extravagant productions were publicly burnt at Paris, by order of the Lieutenant Civil, on the 30th of October, 1625; and one of them, the “Admonitio,” was censured, without difficulty, by the Sorbonne on the following 26th of November. But in the ecclesiastical assembly matters took a different turn. The Gallicans were, at this time, a powerful party, anxious to stand well with the Court, and well disposed towards the ministry of Richelieu. But the Ultramontane section was not less numerously represented in the Synod; and a question of this nature, involving as it did the crucial points at issue between the two schools, was certain to provoke an animated contest.

The Bishop of Chartres, Leonor d’Etampes, a man of high reputation both for character and learning, and a personal friend of Richelieu, was commissioned to draw up a report upon the two libellous treatises. That prelate accordingly presented to the Assembly, on the 13th of December, an elaborate “Declaration,” in which he enlarged on the presumption, insolence, and wicked purposes of the anonymous pamphleteers; asserted, in the loftiest language, the Divine authority of kings, and the consequent necessity of unqualified passive obedience on the part of subjects; defended the policy of the Government both at home and abroad; and extolled, with warm admiration, the genius and virtues of Richelieu.* This document was approved, and ordered to be printed in French and Latin, and the Synod immediately afterwards separated. But the Ultramontanes were by no means disposed to submit tamely to such

* *Mercuré François*, tom. xi., 1068. Le Vassor, Liv. xxii.

a damaging censure of their favourite dogmas; and, with the assistance of the Nuncio Spada, they set every available engine in motion to procure the withdrawal or disavowal of the report. In this they were so far successful that, at a private meeting under the presidency of Cardinal de la Valette,* Archbishop of Toulouse, a second report was adopted, condemning the libel in general terms, but avoiding all mention of theological points in dispute between the Gallicans and the Roman curia. The Parliament of Paris, on the first information of this clerical stratagem, interposed, forbidding the publication of any other manifesto on the subject than that sanctioned by the Assembly on the 13th of December. In the teeth of this injunction, the dissentients, including two cardinals, eight archbishops, and thirty-two bishops, with five deputies of the second order, assembled at the Abbey of St. Geneviève, and signed an act repudiating the report of the Bishop of Chartres, on the ground that the Assembly had never deliberated on its contents. They also petitioned the king to annul the prohibitory decree of the Parliament. The magistrates rejoined by another arrêt, declaring the proceedings of the prelates illegal, null, and void, forbidding future meetings of the clergy for any similar purpose, and ordering the archbishops and bishops to repair to their dioceses within fifteen days, under pain of forfeiting their temporalities.

It must be confessed that the conduct of the French prelates on this occasion was strangely undignified and inconsistent. After solemnly expressing their assent, while constitutionally assembled in Synod, to the declaration prepared by their brother of Chartres, they are suddenly converted to an opposite view of the case, revoke their own act, and put forth a different statement, from which all mention of the grounds of the former censure is carefully excluded. Even the Bishop of Chartres himself came forward, and announced that he accepted the disavowal of the original declaration of which he was the author,

* Louis de Nogaret de la Valette was the third son of the Duke of Epernon, and was raised to the Roman Conclave by Paul V. in 1621. He became one of the staunchest partisans of Richelieu, and the minister, perceiving that his talents lay in a very different line

from that of the ecclesiastical profession, preferred him to various posts of civil authority, and even employed him in the command of armies. Cardinal de la Valette died at Rivoli in Piedmont in 1639.

on condition that the other prelates and deputies would subscribe the three following propositions:—"That no cause whatsoever can justify subjects in revolting against their lawful sovereign;" "That no one upon earth has power to dispense or absolve them from their oath of allegiance;" and "That no power exists which can deprive a monarch of his throne." The Jesuit D'Avrigny endeavours to dispose of the difficulty by alleging that the sentence first published was unauthorized and surreptitious; that the Parliament, whose sentiments it expressed, imposed it upon the world as genuine; and that the second document, disowning the former, was the only one that set forth authentically the judgment of the French clergy upon the work before them.* But this is altogether improbable. In the first place, the report of the Bishop of Chartres was entered upon the official register of the acts of the Assembly; and in the next, it is scarcely credible that, in a case of such general notoriety, any document professing to emanate from the assembled cardinals, prelates, and clergy of the Church could have been put into circulation in Paris, and received as such, unless it had been issued with the sanction of that body. The true solution is to be found, in all probability, in the immense influence wielded by the Jesuits, and in their ceaseless energy and marvellous dexterity in all cases where the interests of the Order were at stake.

Meanwhile two points of considerable importance are illustrated by this transaction. It appears, first, that a great amount of arbitrary pressure was exercised at this period on the ecclesiastical Synod, both by the executive Government and by the Courts of Parliament. And again, it is plain that a reaction had taken place among the clergy, with reference to the Ultramontane doctrines, since the meeting of the States-General in 1614. During that interval of twelve years the principles of Gallicanism had been steadily gaining ground. Du Perron, the champion of the opposite system, had been removed by death in 1618, and had left no one of equal calibre to supply his place. De Bérulle, however able, zealous, and influential in his own sphere, was not fitted by nature for a party leader. Richelieu, who was now master of the situation, had just exhibited the spectacle of a cardinal actively

* D'Avrigny, *Mémoires Chronolog.*, tom. i. p. 387.

sympathising with heretics in declared antagonism to the Pope. Under these circumstances, a decided impulse was given to the development of that system of *national* Catholicism, as distinguished from servile dependence on the Papacy, which afterwards obtained so widely in France;—the system which culminated in the memorable Declaration of the Gallican clergy of 1682.

The clergy protested vehemently against the decree of the Parliament on the 3rd of March, by which they were admonished to close their debates and retire from Paris. They declared that the magistrates had no authority over the Church lawfully represented in Synod; that it was both the right and the duty of the prelates to meet in deliberation on the affairs of religion as often as occasion might require; that at present they were assembled for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, the suppression of the arrêts complained of, and in order to dissuade the public from attaching any weight to them, to the prejudice of their souls and of the respect due to religion. This manifesto was ordered to be burnt by the public executioner, and the Archbishop of Auch and the Bishop of Angers were summoned to the bar of the Parliament to answer for their conduct. It was now apprehended that a serious collision would ensue between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Richelieu thought it time to interfere; and on the 26th of March the king, by his advice, evoked the whole affair to his own cognizance. The Parliament, notwithstanding this, repeated their summons to the two prelates to appear before the Court; upon which the bishops demanded an audience of the king, in order to remonstrate against this abuse of power. This was granted, and the day for receiving them was fixed; but before it arrived the magistrates signified their submission to the Order of Council by which the cause was evoked to the king's person. The conflict was thus cut short, and no further proceedings were taken on either side.

Before the excitement caused by these incidents had subsided, the Ultramontane faction came into still more serious collision with the civil authorities in consequence of a work published at Rome by a Jesuit named Antonio Santarelli, entitled 'De Hæresi, Schismate, Apostasiâ, sollicitatione in sacramento pœnitentiæ, et de potestate summi Pontificis in his delictis puniendis.' The book appeared under the sanction of

the Papal Government, and of Vitelleschi, General of the Jesuits. A few copies having been received by a bookseller in Paris, it fell into the hands of certain fathers of the Order, who, perceiving the dangerous nature of the author's views, immediately notified their apprehensions to Father Cotton, their provincial. Cotton hastened to secure the remaining copies; but, before this could be done, one of them had been inspected by a vigilant doctor of the Sorbonne, who made copious extracts from the volume, and took care that they were widely circulated. The authorities of the Parliament sounded the alarm; a copy of Santarelli's treatise was procured from Lyons, and, being submitted to the Syndic of the Sorbonne and the Advocate-General Servin, proved to abound in matter for serious animadversion.

Santarelli, as an exponent of Ultramontanism, seems to have indulged in a more exaggerated tone than any of his predecessors. According to him, the judgment of the Pope is identical with that of God himself; as Vicar of Christ, he has authority to punish temporal princes for grave dereliction of duty, even to the extent, if he thinks fit, of depriving them of their dominions; he is the sole depository of supreme authority on earth; monarchs are his lieutenants, holding a delegated power, which for just reason may at any time be revoked by him. No mediæval Hildebrand, Innocent, or Boniface, could have exalted the prerogatives of the Holy See to a more monstrous pitch. The case came on for hearing before the Parliament of Paris on the 13th of March, 1626. On this day Louis XIII. held a "bed of justice" for the registration of some edicts, and was present at the scene which followed.

The Advocate-General, at the very moment when he rose to address the Court for the prosecution, was seized with a fit of apoplexy, and expired almost instantaneously. This tragical event was not allowed to interrupt the proceedings. Servin was replaced by Omer Talon, a man of equal ability, and of more moderate temper, whose speech against the inculpatèd Order created intense sensation. Under the influence of these feelings the Court adjudged Santarelli's book to be burned by the hangman on the Place de Grève; after which they proceeded to deliberate whether further penal measures were not required by the occasion; and it was proposed to interdict the

Jesuits from officiating in the pulpit and the confessional, to close their Collège de Clermont, and even to expel them for the second time from France. None of these meditated penalties, however, were inflicted. Whether the magistrates, when their indignation had somewhat cooled, felt that a milder course would meet the emergency; or whether the friends of the Order at court found means to interest the king in their behalf; * or again (which is most probable), whether the Cardinal-minister himself intimated that, although resolved to maintain the supremacy of the Crown, he could not sanction persecution; certain it is that the Jesuits were treated with more clemency than might have been expected. The Parliament contented itself with ordering Father Cotton and his colleagues to appear at the Palais de Justice for examination. They accordingly repaired thither on the day named; where their bearing—modest and submissive, yet withal composed and manly—seems to have conciliated the sympathy of the audience. They were severely interrogated by the first President de Verdun, after which they were required to sign the four following propositions:—1. “The king holds his crown and kingdom only from God and his sword.” 2. “The Pope has no authority, either coercive or directive, over temporal sovereigns.” 3. “The king cannot in any case be excommunicated personally.” 4. “The Pope has no power to release subjects from their oath of allegiance, nor to place the kingdom under an interdict for any cause whatever.” Father Cotton, though at this time he was afflicted with a mortal malady, had sufficient self-command and tact to reply to this demand, that he and his brethren would willingly sign the propositions, *provided the Sorbonne and the Assembly of the clergy then sitting would subscribe them likewise*; but that it was not their province to dictate terms to their superiors. The response was embarrassing; for it was notorious that divisions existed both in the Sorbonne and among the clergy with respect to the doctrines which these articles involved. After some consultation, the Court was on the point of ordering the two leading Jesuits to be arrested, when the first President adjourned the decision to the following

* Mathieu de Molé, at that time Procureur-Général, afterwards the celebrated premier President during the

Fronde, is known to have interceded with Louis to stop the proceedings of the Parliament, but without success.

Monday; and the party made such good use of the breathing-time thus granted them, that Richelieu at last promised that proceedings against them should be dropped, if they would sign a written agreement to adhere to the censure which the Sorbonne and the clergy might pass upon the work of Santarelli, and to support, with regard to its subject matter, the sentiments professed by the Church of France, the Faculty of Theology at Paris, and the Universities of the kingdom. To this the Jesuits assented without difficulty; having done the same thing, as the reader may remember, on a former occasion.* With the aid of certain casuistical refinements, they could always elude the obligation of any undertaking which it might prove inconvenient or disagreeable to fulfil.

Father Cotton breathed his last on the day after this pacific compromise had been arranged between the French Government and the representatives of his Order.† Although his health had been for some time failing, there is no doubt that his end was hastened by the anxiety he had undergone during the progress of this harassing affair. By way of some reparation, and in testimony of respect for his memory, the Archbishop of Paris officiated at the funeral, and pronounced the absolution; and Richelieu himself afterwards visited his tomb, where he remained for some time absorbed in prayer.

When the censure of Santarelli came under the consideration of the Theological Faculty, the doctors found it exceedingly difficult to arrive at a decision. The question was long and vehemently debated by the antagonist parties—the “Duvallistes,” as they were now designated, from their leader André Duval, and the “Richeristes,” so called from their sympathy with the deposed Syndic Edmond Richer. There seems to have been a general feeling that censure in some shape was required; but it was impossible to agree upon the terms. A decree was at length passed condemning the doctrine of Santarelli as “novel, false, erroneous, and contrary to the Word of God; as exposing the dignity of the Sovereign Pontiff to public odium, derogating from the authority of kings, subversive of public peace, and tending to encourage faction, rebellion, sedition, and murderous attempts upon the life of princes.” The minority, however,

* See *supra*, Chapter VI.

† March 19, 1626.

headed by Duval, refused to accept this decision, and strained every nerve to obtain some modification or retrenchment of the terms employed. The question was agitated at many successive meetings with extreme irritation on both sides. The patience of Richelieu was at length exhausted, and he interposed in his usual high-handed style. On the 13th of February, 1627, a royal ordinance forbade the Faculty to take any further proceedings with regard to Santarelli's book, or to publish any report of their deliberations on the subject without the king's permission. The Parliament, in defiance of this command, insisted that the sentence passed by the Sorbonne should be communicated for registration in their archives, and took other steps for prolonging the contest. The consequence was a peremptory order of Council, enjoining the magistrates to interfere no further in an affair which was beyond their cognizance. The king added that, in order to satisfy all parties, he had resolved to appoint a commission of Cardinals and prelates, to settle the definite terms in which the censure of the "detestable and pernicious doctrine" broached by Santarelli should be expressed. This promise, it need scarcely be said, his Majesty had no intention to fulfil. The commission was never issued; but the expedient served its purpose, in terminating, for the time being, a tedious and exasperating controversy, with the further advantage of leaving neither one side nor the other in a position to claim the victory.*

The insurrection of the Huguenots in 1627-8 gave Richelieu a fair opportunity of finally uprooting their political power, and destroying the dangerous anomaly which the age of the Reformation had established in the bosom of the State. Unfortunately for French Protestantism, it had become identified in public opinion with disloyalty and rebellion. It cannot be denied that Calvinism has a certain native antipathy to royalty, and an equally strong affinity to democracy; and this connexion had been exemplified in France with such disastrous results, that the cause of the Reformers no longer commanded any amount of national sympathy. It was essential to Richelieu to re-establish tranquillity within the kingdom, in order to have his

* *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xvii. Le Vassor, Liv. xxii. D'Avrigny, *Mémoires Chronolog.*, tom. i. p. 390, et seqq. Cretineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Comp. de Jésus*, tom. iii.

hands free for prosecuting his schemes of external aggrandisement. † The national mind, disgusted with interminable “Wars of Religion,” and re-acting strongly towards Catholicism, concurred with the minister to a considerable extent; so that although there were those, even among Catholics, who disapproved his policy, he was willingly and warmly supported when, in August, 1627, he undertook the siege of the Huguenot metropolis La Rochelle.

It was one of those enterprises which form a turning-point in the history of nations. “Many a time,” says Richelieu himself, in one of his theological works,* “many a time, while I was residing quietly as bishop in the neighbouring town of Luçon, did I meditate on the possibility of recovering La Rochelle to the obedience of the king, and on the means to be employed for the purpose. The idea passed through my mind in those days like a dream or shadowy imagination. But God having ordained that what I then regarded as a chimera should be taken in hand as a serious reality, I employed myself during the siege in gaining converts from heresy by force of reason and argument, while the king was transforming rebels into loyal subjects by the valour of his arms.” It is true that the Cardinal, as became his character, took measures for giving to the siege of La Rochelle the aspect of an ecclesiastical, as well as a military, undertaking. He filled the royal camp with a well-disciplined array of priests, monks, and missionary preachers; and among those who distinguished themselves by their energy and success in the campaign, we find the names of the Bishop of Maillezais (Henri de Sourdis, afterwards Archbishop of Bordeaux), the Bishop of Mende, the Bishop of Nismes, the Abbé de Marsillac, and the redoubtable Capuchin Father Joseph. Richelieu himself held frequent conferences with the Duc de la Tremoille, and had the satisfaction of witnessing the return of that nobleman to the Catholic Church. His son Louis Maurice de la Tremoille, Comte de Laval, was converted soon afterwards; he not only abjured Protestantism, but entered into holy orders, took the monastic vows in the Abbey of Charroux, and passed the rest of his life in the practice of austere piety. Nevertheless

† See Richelieu's ‘Méthode la plus facile pour convertir ceux qui se sont séparés de l'Eglise.’

the Cardinal by no means confined himself on this great occasion to the peaceful duties which best accorded with his profession. He presided every day at the council of war; and in his position of Lieutenant-General of Aunis, Poitou, and Saintonge, he even discharged the functions of Commander-in-Chief in the absence of the king. The Rochellois, after resisting obstinately for fourteen months, were at length compelled to capitulate on the 28th of October, 1628; when the king granted them an amnesty for past offences, the enjoyment of their property, and the free exercise of their religion in a specified part of the city. On the 1st of November Louis made his triumphant entry into La Rochelle, and Mass was celebrated by Richelieu and the Archbishop of Bordeaux at the Church of Ste. Marguerite, which had previously undergone the ceremony of "reconciliation." It was announced by proclamation that this church would shortly be converted into a cathedral; the nearest episcopal see, that of Maillezais, being transferred to La Rochelle under the sanction of the Pope. This was effected by a bull of Innocent X., dated May 4, 1648. All the churches of the "Pays d'Aunis," with the ecclesiastical property attached to them, were ordered to be restored to the Catholic clergy. The city forfeited its municipal charter and privileges; and it was provided that no stranger or foreigner, no one professing the "pretended Reformed religion," or any other religion than the Catholic, should hereafter be permitted to settle there as a domiciled inhabitant. Finally, the Rochellois were to erect a cross in the principal square, with an inscription recording the reduction of the city; and every year, on the 1st of November, a solemn general procession was to be made in thanksgiving for this signal mercy.*

In the course of the following year, after the submission of the Duke of Rohan, who had prolonged hostilities in Languedoc, a definitive pacification was concluded with the Huguenots by the "Edict of grace," which was promulgated at Nismes in July, 1629. This act deprived the party of its last vestige of independence. The fortifications of all their cautionary towns, which for so long a course of years had formed their rallying

* *Memoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xviii., xix. *Journal de Bassompierre*, tom. iv. Le Vassor, *H. de Louis XIII.*, Liv. xxv.

points and means of self-defence, were to be forthwith destroyed, and hostages were to remain in the king's hands until this should be accomplished. In other respects the conditions of the edict wore an air of moderation and clemency. The Catholic religion was to be everywhere restored, and recognized as that of the State; and the Huguenots were to make restitution of all ecclesiastical property which they had appropriated during the wars; but, on the other hand, the unmolested exercise of their religion was guaranteed to them, they were amnestied for the past, and they preserved all property lawfully belonging to them.* The Cardinal, on proceeding to Toulouse, met with an enthusiastic reception from the population of that town, and was complimented in flattering terms, not only by the magistrates, but even by the Huguenot ministers. He replied to a deputation from the latter body, that his station precluded him from receiving them as representatives of a Church, but that he should always be happy to welcome them as men of science and letters; that he would endeavour to prove on all occasions that the difference of religion should not prevent his rendering them every service in his power; that he wished to make no distinction among the king's subjects except on the ground of loyalty, which he hoped would henceforth be equally manifested in both communions; it being the king's desire to place all classes of his people on an equal footing of confidence and favour.†

Although the success of this last and decisive campaign against the heretics must doubtless be ascribed in the main to the skill and energy of Richelieu, there is reason to believe that, both as to the original design and its execution, he owed much to a brother churchman of a very different spirit, namely, Cardinal de Bérulle. De Bérulle had entertained for years the strongest conviction of the necessity of annihilating the power of the Calvinists, which he regarded as the essential cause of the evils which for sixty-four years past had afflicted France. It was his influence in the Council of State that finally determined the king to besiege La Rochelle; contrary, in the first instance, to the advice of Richelieu, who was apprehensive of a failure, and

* Le Vassor, *Liv.* xxvi.

† Aubéry, *Vie du Card. de Richelieu*, *Liv.* iii. chap. 11.

also hesitated to commit himself to measures which might embroil France with the Protestant powers of Europe.* Such considerations had no weight with the enthusiastic De Bérulle, who believed on this occasion, as indeed he did on most others, that he was acting under a special inspiration from above.

In the midst of no common difficulties and discouragements, he maintained a confident anticipation of success in the end, and exhorted all around him to await patiently and steadfastly God's appointed time. Richelieu could not refrain from occasionally asking his simple-hearted colleague, with half-contemptuous irony, to let him know the *precise moment* when La Rochelle would make its submission to his Majesty's arms. De Bérulle replied, with the utmost seriousness, "I have no positive intelligence on this head, but I have my own sentiments; and since you require it, I am bound to impart them to you. I regard La Rochelle as already secured to the king; and I trust that the event is not far distant. I do not expect it from the dyke which has been thrown across the harbour, nor from the blockade by land; but from some sudden and unforeseen operation. Yet in matters of this kind one ought to be extremely reserved both in judging and speaking, and to bear in mind that saying of our Lord to his Apostles, 'It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power.' These words teach us to fall back into our own nothingness; but they do not oblige us to desist from prayer. I therefore beseech God importunately to shorten the days. It is for the sake of our country that I offer up these prayers to heaven; and I entreat your Eminence not to thwart them."† De Bérulle, when these anxious petitions had at length been granted, failed not to pay his vows of thanksgiving in the church of St. Marguerite at La Rochelle; and caused a painting by the celebrated Le Sueur, representing the Nativity, to be placed over the high altar, the spot where he had been visited with that mysterious foreshadowing which the late events had so completely verified.

De Bérulle lived to witness the final pacification with the Huguenots, but was almost immediately afterwards removed

* Tabaraud, *Hist. de Bérulle*, Liv. v. chap. 4.

† MS. letter of Card. de Bérulle, Dec. 11, 1627, quoted by Tabaraud, Liv. v., chap. 4.

from his career of earthly labour. He expired suddenly at the Oratorian College in the Rue St. Honoré at Paris, on the 2nd of October, 1629. The incurable jealousy of Richelieu's nature had latterly made De Bérulle odious to him ; and a suspicion arose that his death was attributable, in some shape or degree, to the minister's agency. Insinuations of this kind were characteristic of the age, and unfortunately were often substantiated by facts ; but in this instance there is no tittle of evidence to clothe the fiction with any semblance of reality.

CHAPTER VIII.

FROM this summary of the external policy of the Church of France during the earlier years of Richelieu's ministry, I return to the details of its interior history. The reader's attention must be claimed, in the first place, for some new religious institutions belonging to this period, which have not been hitherto noticed.

No name more worthy of pre-eminent honour and veneration is to be found in the records of the 17th century than that of VINCENT DE PAUL. This celebrated man was not, like François de Sales, the scion of a noble house, but sprang from the ranks of the people. His parents were peasants of the village of Pouy, near Dax,* in the Landes of Gascony. Here Vincent was born on the 24th of April, 1576. The religious disposition and love of learning which the boy manifested at a very early age determined his father to devote him to the clerical profession; and after receiving the rudiments of education at Dax, he was sent to study at Toulouse. Here he was admitted to the priesthood in September, 1600. A singular misfortune which befel him not long afterwards seems to have had the effect of shaping the prevailing character of his subsequent ministry. In the course of a coasting voyage from Marseilles to Narbonne, in 1605, the vessel in which he sailed was captured by pirates from Barbary. Vincent was loaded with chains, and sold into slavery at Tunis. In this desolate condition he remained for more than two years, enduring many hardships and much cruel treatment; but learning at the same time inestimable lessons of personal sympathy with human suffering and sorrow; displaying a wonderful example of humility, fortitude, and resignation to the Divine will; and effecting in the end the conversion of his master, a hardened

* Or D'Acqs, as it was anciently written. The town, like others in France, was named by the Romans from the hot springs (*de aquis*) with which the spot abounds.

renegade from Christianity. In company with this man, who became the firstfruits of his missionary zeal, Vincent made escape from Tunis, and returned to Europe; and after spending some time at Rome, he arrived at Paris in 1609. He was charged with an important confidential mission from Paul V. to Henry IV. He was now gradually brought into contact with most of those distinguished and devoted persons who were labouring in various departments for the reorganization of the Church in France. With De Bérulle, who at that time was laying the foundations of the Oratory, he contracted a close friendship, and resided under his roof for several years, not precisely as a member of the new congregation but for the sake of retirement and study under the direction of the Superior. After discharging for some time the duties of parish priest in the suburban village of Clichy, Vincent de Paul was recommended by de Bérulle to the count and countess de Joigny for the responsible post of preceptor of their sons. This nobleman, Philippe Emanuel de Gondy, was the head of a branch of that ancient family, and held the office of *Général des Galères de France*. His wife, a daughter of the Comte de la Rochepot, was one of the most accomplished, intellectual, and religious women of the time. They had three sons, of whom the eldest became Duc de Rohan and general of the Galleys on the resignation of his father; the second died in early boyhood; the third was Jean François Paul, the demagogue of the Fronde, coadjutor to his uncle, Archbishop of Paris, and at length his successor in that office. Vincent accepted the appointment, and his admirable conduct in this new sphere of duty soon won for him the warm esteem not only of the Count and Countess and their family, but of the Countess with whom he had intercourse. While thus employed at the Count's chateau of Folleville, he was one day requested to attend the death-bed of a peasant in the neighbouring village of Gannes, who had expressed an earnest wish to see him. Vincent skilfully did Vincent deal with the burdened conscience of the dying sinner, that he was induced to make a general confession of the errors of his past life, including certain secret griefs which he had never hitherto had the courage to reveal. This afforded him inexpressible relief, and he expired in peace and hope. The occurrence sunk deeply into the mind of Mada

de Gondi, and at her suggestion Vincent de Paul delivered a discourse in the church of Folleville, in January, 1617, exhorting the villagers to avail themselves of the same method of cleansing their consciences and making their peace with God. The result was marvellous. The preacher "bowed the hearts" of the congregation "as the heart of one man"; they were drawn by a simultaneous and irresistible attraction to the tribunal of penance; and so great was the throng of applicants, that Vincent and another priest who assisted him found themselves unequal to the task of hearing their confessions, and were compelled to send for aid to the Jesuit college at Amiens. Such was the first of those parochial "missions" for which Vincent de Paul became so famous. But his lowly spirit shrunk from the *éclat* which followed, as from a dangerous snare; he felt it necessary to relinquish his office in the household of the Comte de Joigny, and retired to an obscure town in the district of Bresse, where he devoted himself to the humblest duties of the pastoral care among a rude, ignorant, and vicious population. Even here his reputation had preceded him, and ere long he found himself the leader of a religious movement in the neighbourhood, which was destined to bear solid and permanent fruit. It was at Chatillon en Bresse that Vincent founded an association to which he gave the name of "confrérie de la charité,"—the first type of a multitude of similar institutions which at no distant date were to overspread France. Its members were females, whose duty was to minister, according to a fixed rule, to the necessities, temporal and spiritual, of the sick poor, under the direction of the parochial clergy. They were called originally "Servantes des pauvres," a title afterwards exchanged for that of "Sœurs de la charité." These sisterhoods were soon appreciated, and multiplied rapidly. In the course of a very few years Vincent established them in upwards of thirty country parishes; and with the co-operation of a benevolent widow lady, Louise Legras, they were introduced into the metropolis in 1629.

Overcome by the urgent solicitations of the Count and Countess de Joigny, Vincent de Paul took up his abode in their family a second time in December, 1617; but his tutorial duties were now scarcely more than nominal, and he was enabled to dedicate himself almost entirely to that which he

regarded as his special vocation, missionary work among people of neglected rural districts. With the assistance of other priests of congenial spirit, he visited various parts of the dioceses of Paris, Beauvais, Soissons, and Sens, where the house of Gondi possessed estates. As the sphere of these operations widened, Vincent and his friends formed a plan for perpetuating them, by founding a distinct institution for the purpose; and the project was realized in 1625 by the munificence of the Countess de Joigny, who by a legal deed of assignment gave the sum of 46,000 livres for the support of a community of missionary clergy, of which Vincent was named the first Superior. The new foundation received the sanction of the Archbishop of Paris, a brother of the Count de Joigny, on the 24th of April 1626; and the ancient Collège des Bons Enfants was made over to Vincent as a residence for himself and his associates. Letters patent were obtained from the Crown, and Pope Urban VI by a bull dated January 12, 1632, erected the society into a congregation by the name of the "Congregation of Priests of the Mission." The charter of foundation, which breathes throughout the characteristic humility of its author, provides that the ecclesiastics thus incorporated shall renounce all thoughts of dignified preferment and fixed benefices, and shall devote themselves exclusively to the work of evangelizing country towns and villages,—preaching, catechising, hearing confessions, and ministering to the spiritual needs of the inhabitants, without receiving any kind of remuneration. They were to pay special attention to prisoners under sentence of *travaux forcés*; and they bound themselves not to exercise their functions in towns where there existed a metropolitan or diocesan see, or a "provincial" court of justice.

Vincent de Paul had only one companion, Antoine Portet, when he established himself at the Collège des Bons Enfants. Six other priests joined him in the following year. Looking back, at the distance of twenty years, on these modest commencements of his work, he says, "We went forth in all honesty and simplicity, commissioned by our superiors the bishops

* The countess did not live to witness the results of this act of large-hearted beneficence. She died on the 23rd of June, 1625, at the age of forty-

one. After her death her husband entered into holy orders, and joined the congregation of the Oratory.

preach the Gospel to the poor, even as our blessed Lord had done; this is what we did, and God, on His part, did what He had foreordained from all eternity. To some extent He blessed our labours; and perceiving this, other good priests entered our Society, not all at once, but at many different periods. O Saviour! who could have imagined that the work would ever reach the state in which we behold it now? If any one had told me this when we began, I should have thought he was mocking me; nevertheless *that* was the commencement from which it has pleased God to raise up our great community. Well! can that be properly called *human* which no human being could ever have conceived? Certainly neither I nor my poor friend Portail ever dreamed of it. Very far indeed were we from cherishing any such idea.*

The "priests of the Mission" had not long plied their calling in the outlying townships and remote hamlets of provincial France, before they discovered that the pastors stood in scarcely less urgent need of reformation than the flock; and that if the people were sunk in ignorance and vice, the main cause lay in the negligence, incapacity, and unedifying example of the clergy. I have already spoken of the general relaxation of discipline which followed the civil and religious distractions of the preceding century; and of the state of degeneracy with regard to learning, zeal, and morals into which the parochial priesthood had consequently fallen. All the leading churchmen of the day were anxiously employed in devising remedies for this most serious evil. The Jesuit colleges were beginning to supply candidates who had undergone a regular course of training for the ministry with considerable care and success; the Oratory, under the direction of De Bérulle, had taken root at Paris, and was gradually extending itself into the provinces by means of affiliated branches; some two or three diocesan Seminaries had been opened, and the bishops seemed disposed to favour similar institutions. But the agencies hitherto attempted were manifestly insufficient to meet the case. Vincent de Paul suggested the experiment of *retreats*, as methods of preparatory discipline for those about to undertake the pastoral office. He submitted his plan first to the Bishop of Beauvais, Augustin

* Abelly, *Vie de M. Vincent*, Liv. i. chap. 47.

Potier de Gesvres, an enlightened and conscientious prelate who gave it his cordial approval; and it was announced that none would be ordained in the diocese of Beauvais without passing through the course of exercises proposed by the Superior of the congregation of the Mission, under his personal direction. The bishop received the candidates in his palace, and he in the Lent of 1628, Vincent de Paul, with the assistance of the priests of his Society, conducted the Retreat, which produced the happiest fruits. The scheme, with the encouraging result of the first trial, was next laid before the Archbishop of Paris, who on many occasions had testified his high esteem of the character and labours of Vincent de Paul; and the retreats for ten years previous to the general ordinations were adopted in the metropolitan diocese by a mandement of February, 1631. The first was held in the Lent of that year at the Collège des Bons Enfants, where Vincent de Paul was then residing. At the subsequent ordination* from seventy to ninety candidates were received in the same institution; and here the priests of the Mission provided them with board and lodging, and all the reasonable comforts, without requiring any payment in return, this being laid down as an essential feature of the system. The daily work was divided into two portions; in the morning the instructions turned upon points of moral theology, the practical functions of the sacerdotal office; upon law divine and human; the Decalogue, the Creed, the Sacraments in general, the nature, varieties, and effects of sin, the duties of the priest in the confessional, the Eucharist as a sacrament and a sacrifice, and the various details of the internal system of the Church. The evening was spent in considering the virtues, qualities, and graces peculiarly necessary to the ministers of Christ, and the means of cultivating them, special stress being laid upon vocation, upon the priestly life, upon the habit of mental prayer, and upon the distinctive character of each order of the ministry. After the lecture, the candidates were assembled in groups of twelve, as nearly as might be of equal capacity and attainment, each under the guidance of a priest of the Mission, for the purpose of conferring together familiarly upon the topics which

* At this time it was usual to hold *six* ordinations in the course of the year.

been brought before them, and thus storing up in the memory materials for future improvement. Every effort was made by Vincent de Paul and his colleagues, in the general arrangements of the establishment, to render the sojourn of the candidates among them not only edifying in the highest sense, but also socially agreeable. They were treated not as strangers, but as friends, on a footing of cordial sympathy and brotherly affection. Their wants and wishes were assiduously studied; the members of the Congregation, with their staff of lay assistants, devoted their whole time and thoughts to the comfort of their guests. That under such circumstances the scheme was eminently successful, and assumed proportions of extraordinary magnitude, cannot excite surprise. From every diocese into which priests had gone forth with the recommendation of having been trained at the Collège des Bons Enfants, encouraging testimony was received to the signal benefits conferred by this means upon the Church. The Bishops of Poitiers, Angoulême, Noyon, Chartres, Saintes, and others, wrote to congratulate Vincent de Paul upon the zeal and ability of the labourers whom he had formed for the Lord's vineyard, and to assure him of the high estimation which they had won from the faithful of all classes. Applications poured in from all parts of France for a larger supply of well-qualified pastors; demands with which the Congregation of the Mission found itself quite unable to comply while restricted within the narrow bounds of its original home. Most opportunely the way was opened, in 1632, for their removal to a much more spacious abode, namely the Priory of St. Lazare in the Faubourg St. Denis, which was in ancient times a hospital for lepers, but had passed into the possession of the Canons Regular of St. Victor. The prior of this community, Adrian Lebon, offered to cede the whole establishment and its dependencies, upon very favourable conditions, to Vincent and his priests. They accordingly took possession of it in January, 1632, the Archbishop of Paris presiding at their installation; and it was from this new acquisition that the members of the Congregation derived the appellation by which they were afterwards most commonly known, that of Lazarists.

Vincent no sooner found himself amply provided with space and other material appliances, than he expanded his field of

action to a degree which he had never before contemplated. One of his first steps after establishing himself at St. Lazare was to set on foot a series of "Conferences;" meetings at which the clergy of Paris and other dioceses might consult together on the difficulties of their ministry, and impart the advantage of mutual experience. This, it need hardly be remarked, was a project which required peculiar delicacy of handling, both with regard to organization and execution. But the character of Vincent de Paul, combining the deepest humility and the tenderest charity with that lofty gift of *wisdom* which, more surely than any merely intellectual endowment, sways and subdues minds of a lower order, was precisely adapted to such an undertaking; and the results of the attempt were in the highest degree satisfactory. The first Conference was held at St. Lazare on the 16th July, 1633; and for many years they were regularly continued on the Tuesday in each week, becoming celebrated far and wide as the "Tuesday Conferences of St. Lazare." A code of rules was drawn up for the association by Vincent de Paul, of which the following were the principal features. That the main object proposed by the members was to honour the incarnate life of the Son of God, His everlasting priesthood, His holy family, and His love towards the poor; to this end they were to study to conform their whole life to His, to labour for the glory of God in all the details of the ecclesiastical career, and especially by diligent ministrations among the poor. The design of the Conferences being to support and build up in practical godliness those who should frequent them, their ordinary subject-matter should be the virtues, functions, and occupations specially appropriate to men dedicated to the service of the Altar. That the members sought by means of this Association to become more closely knit together in Jesus Christ; and with a view to promote this sacred union, they were to be assiduous in visiting and consoling one another, especially in times of sickness and affliction; that these offices of sympathy were to be continued not only during life, but, so far as possible, after death; that the members were to assist at the funeral obsequies of their departed brethren; they were to say three masses for them, or to communicate for their intention. Systematic directions were also given for the employment of each portion of the day. The priests were to rise at a proscribed hour; to devote at least half an hour

to mental prayer; to say Mass, and afterwards to read on their knees a chapter of the New Testament; to engage in certain spiritual exercises before each meal; to spend a definite time in external works of charity; and to conclude the day with a general examination of conscience.

The biographer of Vincent de Paul* enlarges on the incomparable unction, the noble simplicity, the surprising power of Scriptural illustration, the touching pathos, the almost superhuman eloquence, displayed by this eminent servant of God at his Conferences. Nor does his picture appear to be at all overcoloured. It is borne out by the concurrent evidence of numbers of ecclesiastics who were present at these exercises; and the general influence for good accruing from them to the Church is the common theme of the historians of the time.

Bossuet attended a retreat at St. Lazare in the Lent of 1652, previously to his ordination; and of the profound impressions he received on this occasion he has left a remarkable account in a letter to Pope Clement XI., dated August 2, 1702. Some extracts from it will be interesting to the reader. "Ille nos ad sacerdotium promovendos suâ suorumque operâ juvit. Ille secessus pios clericorum, qui ordinandi veniebant, sedulò instituit. Aderant plerumque magni nominis Episcopi. Pium cætum animabat ipse Vincentius, quem cùm disserentem avidi audiremus, tunc impleri sentiebamus Apostolicum illud, 'si quis loquitur, tanquam sermones Dei.' Nosque etiam non semel invitati ut consuetos per illa tempora de rebus ecclesiasticis sermones haberemus, pium laborem, optimi viri orationibus et monitis freti, libenter suscepimus; licuitque nobis affatim illos frui in Domino, ejus virtutes coram intueri, præsertim genuinam illam et Apostolicam charitatem, gravitatem, atque prudentiam cum admirabili simplicitate conjunctam, ecclesiasticæ re studium, zelum animarum, et adversùs omnigenas corruptela invictissimum robur atque constantiam."

The effect produced by the "Tuesday Conferences" of St. Lazare, in raising the tone of feeling and the practical standard of duty among the French clergy, was truly astonishing. It was not long before they attracted the attention of the all-powerful Richelieu, who with his usual penetration at once

* Collet, *Vie de S. Vincent*, tom. i. p. 333.

appreciated their importance. He sent for Vincent de Paul, and desired him to give a detailed account of the nature and progress of his work, of which he expressed his approval. The minister, moreover, took with his own hand a list of the members of the Association, and invited Vincent to mention any whom he deemed peculiarly qualified to be advanced in the Church. A few were accordingly named; and the Cardinal did not fail, as opportunity offered, to recommend them to the king for promotion to vacant sees. After Vincent had retired on this occasion, Richelieu is said to have observed to his niece the Duchess of Aiguillon, "I have always had a very high opinion of M. Vincent; but since my last interview with him, I regard him as a totally different character from what I first imagined."

Among the earliest and most notable members of this clerical association were Adrien Bourdoise, afterwards founder of the seminary of St. Nicolas du Chardonnet; Jacques Olier, founder and first superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice; Jean Duval, Bishop of Babylone, founder of the Congregation des Missions Etrangères; Nicolas Pavillon, the saintly Bishop of Allet, so conspicuous in the Jansenist controversy; Antoine Godeau, Bishop of Grasse; and Louis Abelly, author of a well-known 'Life of St. Vincent.' The institution could reckon, even during the lifetime of Vincent de Paul, the names of thirty-three prelates, whose life and ministry had been moulded upon its system; besides a multitude of dignitaries of lower grades—vicars-general, archdeacons, canons, directors of diocesan seminaries, superiors of religious houses, and parochial clergy.

Not satisfied with these labours for the regeneration of the priestly order, Vincent de Paul commenced the practice of holding retreats at St. Lazare for the laity of all classes and conditions, and threw open his gates with indiscriminate benevolence to all applicants. Within a brief space the antique halls of St. Lazare were more densely crowded with patients tainted with moral leprosy than they had ever been in former days with sufferers under physical disease. Vincent compared his abode to Noah's Ark, where animals of every form, species, and character were lodged together indifferently. It was, indeed, a singular spectacle. This motley assemblage, frequenting the same hospitable board, and listening to the same salutary in-

structions, consisted of noblemen of the highest rank and of the humblest sons of toil and penury; of enlightened magistrates and simple artisans; of courtly men of fashion and rude unlettered peasants; of masters and servants; of old men heavily burdened with the sins and follies of the past, and of youths seeking by timely self-discipline to fortify themselves against the struggles and temptations of the future. Vincent spared no pains to render these retreats lastingly beneficial to his guests, whom he called *Exercitants*. He impressed upon them, as a fundamental principle, that the object to be kept in view by each was to render himself a perfect Christian according to his appointed vocation; a perfect student, if called to a life of study; a perfect lawyer or magistrate, if engaged in the profession of the law; a perfect soldier, if trained to arms; and so with all other walks of life. Scrupulous caution was observed with regard to those who seemed disposed to enter on a conventual life. Vincent never permitted such persons to be determined in their choice of a religious order by any one under his control; and under no circumstances were they to be encouraged to join the congregation of the Mission.* It has been calculated that during the latter twenty-five years of Vincent's life, near 20,000 persons availed themselves of the privilege of making a "retreat" at St Lazare; so that his visitors averaged about eight hundred in each year.† Some few of these paid their own charges during their sojourn, either in part or in full; but the majority contributed nothing at all, either on account of insufficient means or from a mistaken idea that the Lazarists were bound by their statutes to receive all comers gratuitously. Large expenses were incurred in consequence; and many were the remonstrances made to the Superior against what was deemed an extravagant and imprudent outlay. But Vincent was proof against such considerations. "If we had thirty years to live," said he, "and if by our labours

* "Prenez bien garde, Messieurs, lorsque vous donnez conduite à ceux qui viennent faire leurs retraites spirituelles en cette maison, de ne jamais leur rien dire qui tende à les attirer en la Compagnie; c'est à Dieu à y appeler, et à en donner la première inspiration. Quand même ils vous decouvraient qu'ils en ont la pensée, gardez vous bien de les déterminer de vous mêmes

à se faire missionnaires; mais alors dites-leur seulement qu'ils recommandent de plus en plus ce dessein à Dieu; qu'ils y pensent bien, étant une chose importante. Laissons faire Dieu, Messieurs, et nous tenons humblement dans l'attente et dans la dependance des ordres de sa Providence." Collet, Liv. iii. p. 501.

† Collet, Liv. iii. p. 384.

in this work of Retreats we should shorten that space by one half, we ought still to persevere in the same course. It is true that the expense is great, but our funds cannot be better employed; and if our house should become involved in debt, God can find the means of extricating it, and His infinite goodness gives us every reason to believe that He *would* do so in case of need."

The institution of the "Filles de la Charité," already mentioned, was entrusted by Vincent de Paul in 1633 to the direction of his devoted coadjutrix Madame Legras.* This order was originally intended to minister to the sick in country parishes, where there were no hospitals at hand, and medical aid could not be easily procured; but in process of time the sisters were led to undertake other departments of charitable labour among the poor. They were gradually introduced into the hospitals, both in Paris and the provinces, as nurses for the sick; they took charge of the education of foundlings, and conducted female schools; they systematically visited the distressed and destitute; and they performed certain offices of compassion even among prisoners condemned to the galleys. Their constitutions, framed by Vincent de Paul, abound with wise regulations and weighty admonitions. The founder points out that although, from the nature of their employment, they cannot lead a recluse life like other religious societies, they ought nevertheless to be as strict in their conduct as the most austere of cloistered nuns; more so, indeed, inasmuch as they were more exposed to external perils than those who are altogether debarred from intercourse with the world. Their monasteries, he reminds them, would be in ordinary cases the houses of the sick; their cells, a hired lodging; their convent chapel, the parish church; their cloisters, the streets of the city or the wards of hospitals: their vow of seclusion, submission to their superior; their grate, the fear of God; their veil, a holy and rigid modesty. The other provisions of the Rule are conceived in the same spirit of practical wisdom and elevated piety. After having been tested by the experience of twenty years, it was

* This lady was the only daughter of Louis de Marillac, seigneur of Ferrières, and niece of Michel de Marillac, keeper of the seals, and of Marshal de Marillac, both well-known victims of the inexorable vengeance of

Richelieu. On her mother's side she was related to Jean Pierre Camus, Bishop of Belley. Her husband, an officer in the household of Mary de Medici, left her a widow in 1625. She died in 1660, at the age of seventy-eight.

formally approved by Cardinal de Retz, Archbishop of Paris, in 1655, and the letters patent were registered by the Parliament in the following year. The sœurs de la Charité,—or “sœurs grises” as they are sometimes called,—undergo a probation of five years before they are admitted to their office. On this occasion they take the three customary vows of religious profession, to which a fourth is added, pledging them to labour for the poor. These vows are made for the space of one year only, and are renewable annually on the 25th of March, with the previous permission of the Superior. The refusal or suspension of this licence is regarded in the Order as the gravest of all penances, and instances of its infliction are extremely rare.

A kindred association, also originated by Vincent de Paul, and styled the “Compagnie des Dames de Charité,” acquired great reputation and influence at Paris by its energetic labours in the service of the sick and poor. Its members were chiefly ladies of high rank; the Marquise de Magnelais, a daughter of the house of Gondi, sister of the Archbishop of Paris; the Princess of Mantua, afterwards Queen of Poland; Madame d’Aligre, wife of the Chancellor of France; the “Presidente” de Goussault, who became the first superior of the society; Marie Fouquet, mother of the unfortunate finance minister of Louis XIV.; Madame de Lamoignon, wife of the famous magistrate of that name; Madame de Herce; and the favourite niece of Richelieu, the Marquise de Combalet, afterwards Duchess of Aiguillon. At the meetings presided over by these noble matrons benevolent schemes of all kinds were discussed and organized; but the principal duty for which they made themselves responsible was that of visiting the inmates of the Hotel Dieu, or central hospital of Paris. In this undertaking they were zealously seconded by Madame Legras and her Filles de Charité; and a detachment of the latter community was established for this purpose in a house adjoining the hospital. On the recommendation of Vincent de Paul, the ladies formed two divisions, the first having for its province the religious instruction and consolation of the patients, while the second ministered to their temporal necessities. Fourteen members were elected every quarter, in the Ember week, to compose each section; they attended two and two, by rotation at the Hôtel Dieu, every day in the week; and at the end of

their term of service they made a report to the general meeting of the Society, recording the course of their proceedings, with any circumstances which might be useful for the guidance and encouragement of those who were to replace them. It may be well imagined that the spectacle of such self-devotion in those whose birth had placed them on the highest steps of society, and who were accustomed to every luxury that wealth can procure, made a vivid impression upon the inhabitants of Paris in general, independently of the direct benefits conferred upon the sufferers in the hospital. The gentleness, tenderness, and persevering patience displayed by the Dames de Charité in the discharge of their functions was followed by a signal reward. If we may credit the biographer of Vincent de Paul, their success in the work of conversion was such that in the course of a single year, and that the first year of the Society's existence, no less than seven hundred and sixty heretics of different persuasions abjured their errors and embraced the Catholic faith.* The annual outlay of the institution in acts of corporal charity exceeded seven thousand livres.

Volumes would be required to give an adequate idea of the multifarious labours of Vincent de Paul. New establishments of "Priests of the Mission" were gradually formed in most of the large towns of France, and earnest application was made for their services in various foreign countries. In 1639 they planted a colony at Annecy in Savoy; in 1642 they passed the Alps into Italy, and were installed under the patronage of the Duchesse d'Aiguillon in a spacious college at Rome; three years later they were summoned to Genoa by Cardinal Durazzo; and subsequently the Queen of Poland, Mary of Gonzaga, the same who has been mentioned as one of the Dames de Charité, expressed a desire for their ministrations at Warsaw, where she assigned them a house and sufficient revenues.

The Lazarists were also entrusted with the management of diocesan Seminaries in various parts of France; besides the noble college at their head-quarters at St. Lazare, they successively undertook the direction of similar institutions at Saintes, Le Mans, St. Malo, Agen, Tréguier, and Narbonne. This became one of their most fruitful fields of labour; and the

* Collet, Liv. iii. p. 436.

names of St. Vincent de Paul and the Lazarists are inseparably identified with the vital work of clerical education. The impulse of their zeal raised up many earnest co-operators in the cause; among the most distinguished was Jean Jacques Olier, a man scarcely second to Vincent himself in saintly virtue and energetic devotion to the duties of the ministry. Olier was one of those pupils and associates of his early days for whom Vincent had always cherished special affection and unreserved sympathy. On being ordained priest in 1633, he undertook an important mission in connexion with the Abbey of Pebrac in Auvergne; and such was his reputation for ability at this early age, that Richelieu offered him soon afterwards the appointment of coadjutor to the Bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne. Olier, however, declined it, from a strong conviction that he was called to exercise his ministry in a different capacity, namely, as a founder and director of Seminaries. Encouraged by Vincent de Paul, Father Condren, Superior of the Oratory, and other experienced advisers, Olier commenced in 1641 an institution of this kind at Vaugirard, near Paris; and in the following year, having accepted the charge of the parish of St. Sulpice, he transferred his college to that locality. Here he ere long found himself surrounded by a band of zealous associates, many of whom rose in due time to the highest stations in the Church. Among those who are best known to fame were François de Caulet, Bishop of Pamiers, De Gondrin, Archbishop of Sens, and Claude Joly, Bishop of Agen. Besides his chief establishment at St. Sulpice, Olier became the founder of provincial seminaries at Clermont, Le Puy, Viviers, and Bourg St. Andéol; and an offshoot of his congregation was planted even in the French colony of Montreal in Canada. He abridged his life by his excessive labours, and by unsparing asceticism; his death occurred in 1657, in his forty-ninth year. Olier has always been reckoned among the most illustrious sons of the Gallican Church. Bossuet styles him “*virum præstantissimum ac sanctitatis odore florentem* ;” he is eulogized by Fénelon as “*vir traditus gratiæ Dei, et planè apostolicus* ;” * and in a letter from the Assembly of the Clergy to Pope Clement XII., we find him extolled as “*eximium sacerdotem, insigne cleri nostri decus et orna-*

* *Corresp. de Fénelon*, tom. iii., “*Lettres Diverses*,” No. 126.

mentum." The congregation of St. Sulpice possessed, at the epoch of the Revolution, five affiliated seminaries at Paris, and twelve in the provinces.*

Another successful labourer in the same department of Church restoration was Claude Bernard, commonly known by the title of "the poor Priest." From the time of his ordination he dedicated himself exclusively to ministrations among the poor, and sacrificed for their benefit a fortune of 400,000 livres which had been bequeathed to him. In 1638, on the auspicious occasion of the birth of Louis XIV., Bernard instituted a college for the education of priests at the Hotel d'Albiac, in the Rue de la Montagne Ste. G  nevi  ve. Anne of Austria was a munificent contributor to this seminary, by way of thank-offering for what she regarded as a signal token of Divine favour both to herself and to France. The new establishment was entitled the "Seminary of the Thirty-three," in commemoration of the thirty-three years of the Redeemer's life on earth. It was confined to the reception of young students in needy circumstances, who would not otherwise have been able to meet the expense of systematic preparation for the ministry. Numbers of exemplary priests were trained in this establishment for different posts of labour in the Church; many of them devoted themselves with remarkable success to the work of missions, both at home and abroad. Claude Bernard closed his career in March, 1641, at the age of fifty-three. He was succeeded in the government of his seminary by his faithful coadjutor Thomas Le Gauffre, nephew of the well-known Ambroise Le Gauffre, professor in the University of Caen and canon of the Cathedral of Bayeux, who had formerly followed the legal profession, and was one of the masters of the *Chambre des Comptes*, but was won over by the influence of his friend Bernard to embrace a religious life and enter the priesthood. Le Gauffre died in 1646, when he had just been designated to the see of the new French colony of Montreal. He possessed a considerable fortune, and left by his will large benefactions to the Seminary of the Thirty-three, as well as to other charitable institutions at Paris.

* *Vie de M. Olier, Fondateur du S  minaire de S. Sulpice*, Paris, 1853.

CHAPTER IX.

THE memorable reformation of the Order of St. Benedict in France was originated by Dom Didier de la Cour, prior of the abbey of St. Vanne * at Verdun. After struggling with inflexible constancy and courage against the torrent of degenerate example that surrounded him, he succeeded in inducing some of his brother monks, and a few novices who joined them, to re-establish the Rule of St. Benedict in all its pristine severity. He was supported by his superior the Bishop of Verdun, who was also Abbot of St. Vanne; and Pope Clement VIII. issued a brief expressly sanctioning the movement.† By degrees the fame of Didier de la Cour was extended far and wide; and applicants arrived at St. Vanne from distant parts of France, as well as from Germany and the Netherlands, soliciting the particulars of his system, and aid towards carrying out the same corrective measures in other monasteries. The first abbey which embraced the strict rule upon the model of St. Vanne was that of St. Augustin at Limoges, where the abbot, Jean Regnault, introduced it in 1613. The spirit of ancient discipline, once aroused, spread rapidly on all sides; the abbeys of St. Faron at Meaux, of St. Julien at Nouillé, of St. Pierre of Jumièges, and of Bernay, followed the example of St. Vanne; and Didier de la Cour, so far as the resources of his house allowed, despatched members of his reformed congregation in various directions to explain his system and superintend its inauguration in other convents. But Lorraine, where St. Vanne was situated, did not form at that period part of the kingdom of France; and in proportion as the reformed rule continued to gain acceptance, it was found difficult and almost impracticable to combine so many religious houses in close dependence on an authority which was seated in a foreign country. It was therefore determined, at a general

* St. Vanne or Venne (Vitonius in Latin) was a bishop of Verdun in the sixth century.

† April 7, 1604.

chapter of the Order held at Toul in May, 1618, that a distinct Benedictine Congregation should be founded in France, to consist of the convents where the restored discipline had been already adopted, and of others which, in emulation of their zeal, might be led from time to time to take a similar course. By a special Act of the same date, it was ordained that the most intimate friendship and sympathy should be maintained between the two Congregations; that they should zealously promote this by intercommunion in prayers, sacraments, and works of charity; and that thus they should compose in reality but one corporate body.

The person mainly instrumental in executing this design was Laurent Bénard, doctor of the Sorbonne and prior of the College of Cluny at Paris, who had some time previously made a journey to St. Vanne for the purpose of renewing his profession according to the reformed rule. He had for coadjutors several monks of the abbey of St. Vanne, chosen for their piety and general merit—Anselme Rolle, Colomban Regnier, Adrien Langlois, Maur Tassin, Martin Taisnière, and Athanase de Mongin. In August of the same year 1618 they obtained letters patent for the erection of the new congregation, to which they gave the name of the “Congregation of Saint-Maur,” from a venerated disciple of St. Benedict, who towards the middle of the sixth century first established the rule in France.* Bénard was encouraged in his undertaking by various personages of high station and authority; Cardinal de Retz, Cardinal de Sourdis, the presidents Nicolai and de Hennequin, and particularly by Mathieu Molé, at that time Procureur-General, afterwards first President of the Parliament of Paris and Keeper of the Seals. The first monastery of which the brethren of St. Maur obtained possession at Paris was that of Blancs-Manteaux, where they were installed on the 5th of September, 1618.† During the next ten years

* Maurus founded the Abbey of Glanfeuil in Anjou, which was afterwards called by his name, Saint Maur sur Loire.

† Laurent Bénard was not spared to witness more than this first step towards the accomplishment of his great object. He died at the Collège de Cluni on the 20th of April, 1620, at the age of forty-seven. His epitaph, written

by Hugues Ménard, then Professor of Rhetoric at the same college, testifies to the high estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries. “Laurentius Bénard Nivernensis, Prior Collegii Cluniacensis, Doctor Parisiensis, non modò humaniorum politiorumque litterarum peritissimus, sed maximè in rebus ecclesiasticis monasticisque longè versatus. Vidit nascentem S. Mauni

the order made such rapid progress in the provinces, that no less than forty convents had given in their adherence to the new system when it was introduced into the magnificent abbey of St. Denis "en France" in 1633. But the most celebrated seat of the Congregation of St. Maur was the abbey of St. Germain des Près at Paris—perhaps the richest and most powerful monastic foundation in the kingdom. This church and monastery were originally built by King Childebert I., in 543, on the site of a Roman temple of Isis, in the midst of some spacious meadows bordering the left bank of the Seine. The abbey bore at first the names of Ste. Croix and St. Vincent, but was afterwards re-consecrated in honour of St. Germain Bishop of Paris, who was interred there in the year 576. During the middle ages this establishment acquired extraordinary privileges. It was a dependency of the Holy See, and exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Paris. The abbot was invested with seignorial powers, possessing both the "haute" and the "basse justice," not only within the precincts of the monastery, but over a large district of the city, comprising the modern Faubourg St. Germain, and indeed almost the whole of Paris south of the Seine. In later times (1667) an arrangement was entered into by which the jurisdiction hitherto vested in the Abbot of St. Germain des Près was transferred to the archbishop of Paris, on condition that the Prior of the Abbey and his successors should be *ex officio* Grand Vicars of the archdiocese, and that the abbot should retain his jurisdiction as ordinary within the precincts of the abbey. The corporate revenues of the house amounted to 350,000 livres per annum, and the abbot's income was 170,000 livres. This splendid appointment was always held by a person of rank, not unfrequently by princes of the blood royal. Louis XIII. conferred it in 1623 on his natural brother Henri de Bourbon (a son of Henry IV. by Henriette de Balsac), who also held the episcopal see of Metz. It was under the sanction of this prelate that the Benedictines of St. Maur took possession of St. Germain des Près on the 14th of February, 1631, and it became thence-

congregationem, quam officio et amore publico bono monumenta." — Tassin, coluit, jovit operâ, ac seipsum totum *Hist. Littéraire de la Congreg. de S. Maur.* illi obtulit consecravitque. Multa sui ingenii posteritati reliquit atque edidit

forward the ordinary residence of the Superior-General of the Congregation.

Eventually the Benedictines of the Congregation of St. Maur became the occupants of more than one hundred and eighty conventual houses in different parts of France, which were divided into six "provinces;" namely, 1. France. 2. Normandy. 3. Burgundy. 4. Toulouse. 5. Brittany. 6. Chezal-Benoît.

This celebrated body was governed by a Superior-general, two assistants, and six visitors, who were elected every three years at a general chapter of the order, held at Marmoutiers near Tours. The superiors of each monastery were also chosen triennially; but the General might retain office by successive nominations during life.

One of the chief objects contemplated by the Benedictine reform was to train up a *succession* of monks formed according to the true pattern of primitive Monachism. With a view to this one or more houses called Noviciates were established in each "province" for the reception of young men preparing to make profession of religion; from these, after one year's probation, the candidates were transferred to different monasteries, where the two following years were devoted to a further course of systematic training; and these being completed, a period of five years more was spent in the study of philosophy and theology, with particular reference to the interpretation of Scripture and of the works of the Fathers. These labours were succeeded by a year which was termed the year of "recollection;" this was prescribed as a special preparation for receiving holy orders; it was to be passed in strict retirement, and exclusive application to devotional exercises.

During the earlier years of its history this noble institution was directed with rare tact and energy by the first Superior general,* Dom Jean Gregoire Tardieu, who was elected in 1630. His first care was to make a personal visitation of all the monasteries, many of which he found in a state of lamentable dilapidation, from the ravages of the religious wars and the negligence of former abbots. The work of restoration was

* "Quoique d'autres eussent gouvernés cette société naissante en qualité de *Présidens*, Dom Tardieu passe pour en avoir été premier *Général*, parceque

c'est lui qui l'a étendue, et lui a donné sa consistance."—Félibien, *Histoire de Paris*, vol. ii. 1352.

commenced without delay, and Tарisse had the satisfaction of seeing twenty Benedictine houses entirely rebuilt, and upwards of fifty more or less repaired. Under his vigilant rule many scandalous abuses were reformed, animosities and contentions were appeased, and strict discipline was re-established. Tарisse was warmly supported in his plans by Cardinal Richelieu, who made him a member of his "conseil de conscience," and frequently sought his advice. He also stood high in the esteem of Anne of Austria; and lived on terms of confidential intimacy with Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, the president Mathieu Molé, and with Vincent de Paul. But perhaps the chief merit of Tарisse consists in his having laid the foundations of that illustrious school of ecclesiastical learning which has secured for the Congregation of St. Maur the lasting gratitude and admiration of succeeding ages. Himself a man not more remarkable for fervent piety than for enlargement of mind and cultivated taste, he laboured to kindle among the reformed Benedictines a spirit of literary enterprise and industry. Under his direction libraries were established in all the convents, and the best-qualified brethren were employed in collecting precious manuscripts and printed works on a wide circle of subjects—classical antiquity, the Greek and Latin Fathers, the oriental languages, history, archæology, hagiology—which had hitherto been very imperfectly explored by the scholar and the critic. The impulse thus given to various branches of study wrought astonishing effects. Troops of enthusiastic students thronged the venerable cloisters of S. Germain des Près, whose immense services to the Church and to the world of letters have rendered their names and fame imperishable.*

Tарisse, who had long been suffering from the inroads of a painful and incurable disease, resigned his charge in the year 1648, and died a few months afterwards. But he left behind him at S. Germain des Près men formed under his own eye and by the power of his own example, and amply qualified to carry on the work to which his life had been devoted. The most conspicuous of his immediate followers was Dom Jean

* See *Histoire littéraire de la Congregation de S. Maur*, par Dom René Prosper Tassin.

Luc d'Achery, a native of St. Quentin, where he was born in 1609. He originally made his profession at the Benedictine convent of that town, but migrated in 1632 to the Abbey of the Holy Trinity at Vendôme, which was then in the hands of the Congregation of S. Maur. Shortly afterwards he was induced to remove to S. Germain des Près at Paris, and in that establishment he passed the remainder of his life. Here the Superior-general Tarris, quickly appreciating his talents, appointed him curator of the library; and he at once commenced his labours by drawing up accurate catalogues of its vast contents, among which were manuscripts of great value, mouldering in the accumulated dust of centuries of neglect. The results of his researches were given to the world from time to time in a series of learned tomes, consisting chiefly of works never before published. The most celebrated production of D'Achery is that entitled '*Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliæ bibliothecis, maximè Benedictinorum, latuerant, Spicilegium.*' Under this modest appellation he edited a voluminous collection of materials for the Church history of the middle ages; chronicles, acts and canons of Councils, lives of saints, charters of religious houses, royal grants, poetical pieces, letters, and a mass of other documents which had never hitherto seen the light. The work extends to thirteen volumes quarto. It is to D'Achery, moreover, that the Church is indebted for the conception, and in part for the execution, of that noble undertaking which was completed after his death by his associate and disciple Mabillon, the '*Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti.*' This appeared in nine folio volumes, the first of which was published in 1668.

The female communities of the Benedictine rule were by no means behindhand in this great movement of conventual reform. One of them, the Abbey of Port Royal des Champs, has obtained a world-wide celebrity, not only on account of the extraordinary character of the Abbess by whom its restoration was effected, but also from its close connexion with that controversy on the doctrines of free will, election, and efficacious grace, which agitated the Church during the latter half of the 17th century. For this very reason, however, it is a matter of no small difficulty to disentangle the complicated web of this eventful history; for where party interests are deeply involved,

the recklessness of party spirit never hesitates to warp and distort facts in different directions in favour of some foregone conclusion. The pens which have delineated Port Royal have seldom, if ever, been free from partiality and prejudice; the reason of which is manifest. Not only did the great struggle of which it was the centre array in two antagonist camps the ablest thinkers and writers of the particular age which gave it birth, but the results of that struggle have survived from that day to the present; they are continually reappearing on the surface of Church history; continually forcing themselves on the attention of observant minds, under manifold phases and varying designations. Nor are they matters of exclusive moment to the Roman Communion. Every section of Christendom, every school of religious sentiment, has its interest, more or less, in encouraging this or that view of the disputed questions and the exciting, yet often obscure, transactions identified with the story of Port Royal.

The Abbey of Port Royal des Champs* was situated in a deep valley near the town of Chevreuse, fifteen miles south-west of Paris. It was founded in the year 1204 by Mathilde de Garlande, wife of Mathieu de Marli, a cadet of the noble house of Montmorency, who had set out two years before to join the Fourth Crusade. Port Royal belonged to the order of Bernardines or Cistercians, which followed substantially the rule of St. Benedict; and was subject to the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Citeaux. The close of the 16th century found Port Royal, like the majority of the religious houses in France, in a state of scandalous degeneracy. Its professed rule was ignored; the nuns had ceased to observe even the law of seclusion; the prescribed routine of daily devotion and ascetic exercises was exchanged for habits of frivolous amusement and luxurious indulgence. In 1599 Marie Angélique Arnauld, at that time a child between eight and nine years of age, was appointed coadjutrix to Jeanne de Boulchard, the Abbess; and this event, however unpromising in appearance, led to a complete revolution in the state of affairs both in that and in many other French convents, and made them no less distinguished for exact regularity and high-souled piety than they

* *Abrégé de l'Histoire de Port Royal*, par M. Racine, de l'Académie Française, Paris, 1770. Bonav. Racine, *Hist. Écclés.*, tom. x. p. 472 et seqq.

had once been notorious for negligence, sloth, and worldliness. It need hardly be observed that the admission of a girl like Angélique to the cloistered state (as well as of her sister Agnes, who at the same time became Abbess of St. Cyr) was a flagrant infraction of the canons, though by no means unusual in those days. Immediately after taking the vows Angélique was placed in the Cistercian convent of Maubuisson near Pontoise, of which Angélique d'Estrées, a sister of La Belle Gabrielle, the mistress of Henry IV., was then superior. Here she remained till the summer of 1602, when, upon the death of the Abbess de Boulchard, she proceeded to take possession of her office at Port Royal, and was consecrated by the Superior general of the order, the Abbot of Cîteaux. On the same day she made her first communion, having at this time just completed her eleventh year.

There were then at Port Royal only eleven professed nuns (three of whom were in a state of imbecility) and three novices. The confessor of the convent was grossly ignorant, the sisters careless and light-minded. The Holy Eucharist was celebrated in the chapel only once a month and on the greater festivals. Preaching had been wholly disused for thirty years past. Masquerades and other unbecoming exhibitions were practised during the Carnival. During the next six years the new abbess allowed things to continue in the same course; but at the end of that time her mind was providentially awakened, and received profound religious impressions, through the preaching of a vagrant Capuchin friar, who visited Port Royal apparently by accident, and was requested to occupy the pulpit in the convent church. From this epoch (Lent, 1608) Angélique dated her conversion; and marvellously indeed did that event develop the latent faculties both of her intellectual and moral nature. She now determined to undertake a radical reformation of the abbey; to practise the rule of St. Benedict in all its severity herself, and to enforce its observance by those over whom she was set in authority. Her first step was to make a solemn renewal of her vows, as she held her former profession to be invalid on account of the uncanonical age at which it had been made. She next caused the convent to be walled in, and exacted from the nuns a rigid compliance with the primary obligation of seclusion. Angélique took care to exhibit in her

own person an example of the strictness and self-abnegation which she required from others. On one remarkable occasion (known in the convent annals as the "*Journée du guichet*," September 25th, 1609), she refused admission even to her own father and mother and other near relatives; nor could their passionate tears and angry remonstrances induce her to revoke this prohibition. By degrees, though not without stubborn opposition, Angélique succeeded in winning over the whole sisterhood of Port Royal to her own views. Her gentleness and patience, combined with transparent sincerity and steadfastness of purpose, were irresistible; and within the space of five years she had re-established all the rigorous observances of the Benedictine rule.

The reforms at Port Royal became famous; emulation was excited; and although the work was ridiculed in many quarters, and even condemned by several of the Superiors of the Order, the services of Angélique were soon put in requisition in behalf of other Benedictine houses, and the movement rapidly extended throughout the north of France. In February, 1618, Angélique was commissioned by the Abbot of Cîteaux to assume the temporary government of the convent of Maubuisson, where she had spent some years of her early youth. The Abbess d'Estrées had recently been removed from office for gross misconduct, and confined, by order of the Parliament, in a penitentiary at Paris. Angélique repaired without delay to Maubuisson, taking with her four sisters from Port Royal, and laboured energetically to improve its condition; but in the course of a few months the deposed abbess found means to escape from her imprisonment, and reappeared at Maubuisson under the escort of a band of gay cavaliers from Paris, with whose assistance she forcibly expelled Angélique and her nuns, and resumed her place as abbess. She was speedily recaptured by a guard of soldiers under the "*Prévôt de l'Isle*" in person, and once more consigned to prison. Angélique was now reinstated in peaceable possession of the convent, and remained there for nearly five years, during which time she carried out her plans of reformation with eminent success, particularly by introducing many fresh nuns of a poorer class, whom she trained assiduously on her own system.

During her sojourn at Maubuisson the Abbess Angélique

became acquainted with St. François de Sales, who had come to Paris in 1618 on a mission from his sovereign the Duke of Savoy, to demand the hand of the Princess Christine, sister of Louis XIII., for the Prince of Piedmont. The Bishop of Geneva visited both Maubuisson and Port Royal, and at the latter convent administered the Sacrament of Confirmation. Relations of confidential friendship were ere long established between him and the abbess; she placed herself under his spiritual guidance, and corresponded with him constantly until his death.* That event took place on his journey back to his diocese from this last visit to the French capital, on the 28th of December, 1622. Through St. François Angélique was also brought into close communication with Madame de Chantal, who, in 1619, opened a convent of the Visitandines at Paris. These two highly-gifted women were not long in learning to appreciate each other, and there ensued between them a correspondence which was kept up uninterruptedly for more than twenty years, to their great mutual comfort and edification.

In addition to her work at Maubuisson, Angélique Arnauld became the instrument of revived discipline at the Benedictine houses of Le Lys, near Melun; St. Aubin and Gomerfontaine, in Normandy; and the Iles d'Auxerre and Tard, in Burgundy. Detachments of nuns were sent from Port Royal to undertake these charitable missions as opportunity offered; and Angélique found a zealous auxiliary in her sister Agnes, Abbess of St. Cyr, who supplied her place as coadjutrix at Port Royal during her absence. An abbess of respectable character having at length been nominated to Maubuisson, Angélique finally quitted that convent and returned to Port Royal in March, 1623, attended by a train of twenty-five nuns, who had taken the vows during her residence there, and whom she had inspired with such affectionate attachment that they refused to leave her. Such was now the flourishing state of the community governed by Angélique, that Port Royal no longer afforded the accommodation necessary for their numbers; the convent, moreover, was

* During a sermon which he preached at Port Royal, St. François was suddenly overcome by deep emotion, and was obliged to pause for some moments. The abbess afterwards inquired the cause: "Alas, Madame,"

replied the prelate, "God has revealed to me that your house will fall away from the Faith. The only way to preserve it is to be obedient to the Holy Sac."—*Vie de S. François de S.* par le Curé de S. Sulpice, tom. ii. p. 216.

in a damp, unhealthy situation, where the inmates suffered much from the defective drainage. Angélique was induced by these causes to obtain permission to transfer the establishment to Paris. Through the kind liberality of her mother, Madame Arnauld, and other ladies of distinction, a large house in the Faubourg S. Jacques was appropriated to their use;* and thither Angélique removed, with her whole sisterhood of eighty-four nuns, in the year 1626. Their ancient habitation, thenceforth known as Port Royal *des Champs*, was left in charge of a single chaplain, to celebrate divine offices; and it subsequently became the residence of that illustrious company of recluses, whose names will be familiar to the latest posterity as “Messieurs de Port Royal.”

Further measures were adopted not long afterwards, which had an important bearing on the destinies of Port Royal. In 1627, a brief was procured from Pope Urban VIII., by which the convent was withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Citieux, and placed under that of the diocesan, the Archbishop of Paris. The step was taken from the most disinterested motives; but it proved, as the sequel will show, the source of some of the heaviest trials which befel the community in its days of persecution. Another object which Angélique had much at heart was accomplished in 1629: when Louis XIII. renounced by letters patent the right of the Crown to nominate the superiors of Port Royal, and ordained that for the future the appointment should be made by election, and triennially. The necessary formalities having been completed, Angélique Arnauld divested herself of her abbatial dignity in the presence of the official of the Archbishop of Paris, in July, 1630; her sister Agnes resigning at the same time the office of coadjutrix, on the express condition that the reforms already introduced at the convent should be strictly maintained. The first election under the new arrangements took place on the 23d of July, when Marie Geneviève le Tardif was chosen Abbess, and retained the appointment, by a re-election three years afterwards, till 1636.

Up to this time Port Royal had not contracted any peculiar theological bias. During the earlier period of her career, the

* The Convent of Port Royal de Paris, after having served as a prison for the aristocratic detenus of the Revolution, is at the present day the “Hôpital de la Maternité,” or Lying-in Hospital.

opinions of Angélique and her associates were mainly influenced by the teaching of St. François de Sales; whose views of the mysterious doctrines of Grace were such as might be expected from his own generous and warm-hearted nature, as well as from his dispassionate study of the divinity of all schools and all ages, which preserved him from the snares of sectarian extravagance. St. François had learned to regard human nature, notwithstanding its fall from original righteousness, as still instinctively disposed to love God and goodness; but although *disposed*, he knew that man is not *able* to love God as he ought without the aid of supernatural grace. The human will, he taught, although degenerate, yet possesses the faculty of co-operating with Divine grace; according to the text "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance." "It is certain," thus he expresses himself in the '*Traité sur l'amour de Dieu*,' "it is certain that to him who is faithful in a little, and performs what lies in his power, the loving-kindness of God *never denies His assistance* to carry him forward more and more."* During the violent discussions which arose from the work of the Jesuit Molina, '*De liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis concordia*,' St. François de Sales maintained a discreet reserve, declining, when consulted, to commit himself on either side; and with the wisdom of this course he had full reason to be satisfied, when, after the protracted debates of the Congregation "*de Auxiliis*," which occupied no less than eleven years, the supreme authority of the Church adjourned the question indefinitely, and refrained from pronouncing any positive decision. The time, however, was now approaching, when this interminable controversy was to be revived under new auspices. Fresh champions were ready to descend into the lists, whose resources, resolution, and enthusiasm promised anything rather than a speedy adjustment of their quarrel. After the death of St. François de Sales, the community of Port Royal selected as their spiritual adviser Zamet, Bishop of Langres, a prelate who in early life had made a figure in the brilliant circles of the court, but had latterly renounced his worldly habits, and was distinguished for his devotion to the duties of the pastoral care. Zamet, in conjunc-

* See his Letter to the Jesuit Lessius, quoted by Crétineau-Joly, *Hist. de la Comp. de Jésus*, tom. iii. p. 23.

tion with the Duchess of Longueville, formed the project of a religious house dedicated to the perpetual adoration of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; and having obtained a bull for the purpose from Rome, and letters patent from the Crown (which were granted with much difficulty in 1630) he commenced the work in a hired house in the Rue Coquillière, and placed Angélique at the head of the institution. Her sister Agnes, who likewise became an inmate of the "Maison du Saint Sacrement," composed, for her private edification, a little book entitled 'Le Chapelet secret du S. Sacrement.' It was divided into sixteen heads, corresponding with the number of centuries since the institution of the Eucharist; and contained under each head some spiritual meditations suggested by one of the attributes or offices of the Divine Redeemer. This production was greatly admired by the sisters, several of whom copied it for their own use; and in course of time, having been approved by the Bishop of Langres, it appeared in print. A keen controversy arose upon its merits. It was attacked by Father Binet, a Jesuit; and Jean du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of St. Cyran, who had already made himself known as an opponent of that Society, employed his pen in its defence. It is insinuated, indeed, by D'Avrigny and others of his school, that the authorship of the 'Chapelet secret' belonged to St. Cyran himself; so closely does it correspond with his known sentiments and style. But for this surmise there is no foundation. St. Cyran was at that time a total stranger to Port Royal. The manual was condemned by Duval and seven other doctors of the Sorbonne (June 18, 1633) as containing much that was erroneous, extravagant, and even impious; whereupon St. Cyran, to counterbalance this censure, procured an approbation of the work from his friend Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, and from another well-known doctor of the University of Louvain. Theologians being thus divided in opinion, the question was referred to Rome; and the Sovereign Pontiff pronounced that the volume was not deserving of censure on the score of false doctrine, but that it was expedient, nevertheless, to withdraw it from circulation, lest it might be misused by the simple and inexperienced to their injury. The 'Chapelet secret' was accordingly suppressed. The chief interest of this occurrence consists in its having been the means of bringing the Abbé de St. Cyran into connexion with Angélique Arnauld and

the Society of Port Royal;—a connexion from which may be dated the rise of Jansenism in the Church of France.* The Bishop of Langres, delighted with the versatile talents and acquirements displayed by St. Cyran, took the first opportunity of introducing him to the sisterhood of the St. Sacrement; and in the following year, 1636, on the return of Angélique to Port Royal de Paris, the Abbé was formally installed as director of the community. It would be premature to enter farther into the details of this portion of our narrative until other events have been reviewed, which will serve to show how closely Port Royal is identified with the general stream of the ecclesiastical history of the time.

* "Une doctrine de réforme morale ne vaut que par l'application, et ne compte dans le monde que du jour où elle se réalise dans une groupe qui croit et pratique. Saint Cyran trouva enfin un terrain propice. Il s'était rencontré avec une femme qui, en dehors des querelles dogmatiques, avait tenté

de réaliser, depuis vingt cinq ans, au fond de son cloître, cette transformation des âmes qu'il rêvait. De 1635 à 1636 la Mère Angélique passa, avec ses Bénédictines, sous la direction spirituelle de Saint Cyran. Dès lors celui-ci eût une base d'opérations."—H. Martin, *Hist. de Fr.*, tom. xii. p. 83.

CHAPTER X.

RICHELIEU displayed, in his administration of ecclesiastical affairs, the same qualities which characterized his civil policy ;— the same all-grasping ambition, the same penetrating discernment of the capacities and tendencies of others, the same implacable vindictiveness, the same determination to uphold with a high hand the independent nationality of France. It was clear, from the outset of his ministry, that he was not one to allow himself to be embarrassed by ordinary scruples, either in the shaping of his public measures or with regard to personal interests. Though a prince of the Church, he was not unfrequently in a state of open variance with the Court of Rome. These differences had their origin in his own inordinate greediness of power. One of his first acts was to solicit the appointment of perpetual Legate of the Holy See, which had formerly been held by the Cardinal of Amboise, prime minister of Louis XII. ; but his arrogant character had already inspired the Pope with jealousy, and no disposition was shown to gratify him. The coveted dignity was offered to him for three months, but this he would not condescend to accept.* He next applied for the inferior office of Legate of Avignon ; but here again he met with a mortifying refusal. Further causes of irritation followed. The Cardinal, as we have seen, had no hesitation in preferring the Protestant to the Catholic alliance, when he judged that course more conducive to the advantage of France, and the general maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. This offence naturally made him distrusted at Rome, and his views were, in consequence, thwarted so far as this could be done without risking a serious rupture. Richelieu was already Abbot of Cluny, one of the highest and most lucrative preferments in the French Church. In 1635 he was named Superior-General of Cîteaux, on the resignation of the Abbot

* D'Avrigny, *Mémoires*, tom. ii. p. 133.

Nivelles, who earnestly recommended him as his successor, on the score of his zeal for the reformation of the monastic system. A similar honour was conferred upon him by the Premonstratensian Order; so that these proceedings, if confirmed, would have united in his hands the government of three of the most powerful Societies in Europe. But opposition was made by some of the subordinate houses, both in France and elsewhere: and Urban VIII., nothing loth, refused the bulls of institution. He also negatived a proposal made by Richelieu to reform the Order of Cluny by incorporating it with the newly-formed Congregation of St. Maur.* Another grievance much resented by the minister was the Pope's obstinate refusal to bestow a cardinal's hat on his confidential friend and agent, the Capuchin Father Joseph.

Matters became complicated by fresh affronts and misunderstandings. The Roman Chancery had lately grown extortionate in its pecuniary demands on promotion to episcopal sees, and in assessing that most unpopular impost, the annates. It had been also ordered that the testimonials of character (*informations de vie et de mœurs*), required by Church dignitaries nominated by the Crown, should be sought, not, as heretofore, from the diocesan ordinaries, but from the Apostolic Nuncio,—in manifest derogation of the “Gallican liberties.”† From these causes several French sees had remained long vacant, the bishops-designate being unable to obtain the necessary Papal mandate for their consecration.‡ These difficulties were increased by the fact that the office of “Protector of France” at Rome, though nominally held by Cardinal Antonio Barberini, was practically in abeyance, since the Pope would not allow his nephew to discharge the duties belonging to it.§

Richelieu instigated the clergy to complain loudly of these and other abuses. It was suggested that the proper remedy was the convocation of a National Council, to settle by its own authority the internal concerns of the Gallican Church. Canonical appointments might be made, it was urged, without

* *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xxviii.

† *Mémoires d'Omer Talon*, tom. i. (Petitot.) Aubery, *Hist. du Card. Mazarin*, Liv. i.

‡ See Richelieu's letter to the Pope,

Lettre cexlvii.

§ *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xxix. Levassor, *Hist. de Louis XIII.*, Liv. xxxvi. *Lettres du Card. de Richelieu*. Lett. cexliv. Au Maréchal de Créquy.

the formality of institution by the Pope; and his Holiness ought to be plainly informed that, if the bulls for the vacant sees were not at once forthcoming, France would dispense with them altogether. It appears, indeed, that an Order of Council was made and signed, forbidding the king's subjects to apply in future to the Court of Rome for any such purposes. But the Parliament, for some technical reason, objected to register it; and the Nuncio, through the good offices of Father Joseph, succeeded in obtaining a postponement of the measure until fresh instructions should arrive from the Pope, whom he represented as willing to give the king satisfaction.*

The outcry for a Gallican Synod, however, continued; and it began to be hinted that such an assembly might judge it expedient to take further steps towards readjusting the relations between France and Rome. It might go so far as to annul the Concordat of Bologna, renounce subjection to the Pope beyond acknowledging the primacy of his see, and place France under the government of an independent Patriarch. Grotius, who was at Paris at the time in the capacity of Envoy from the Queen of Sweden, mentions, in one of his letters to the Chancellor Oxenstiern, that such a report was in circulation; and adds that it was generally believed that Richelieu himself would be raised to this new ecclesiastical dignity.† That the idea was canvassed, at this moment of excitement, is certain; but it is not likely that the Cardinal ever had any serious intention of putting it in execution.

As if to aggravate these bitter feelings, an outrage was offered about the same time to the French ambassador at Rome in the person of one of his servants, who was killed in an affray with the police. The Pope, too, showed his ill-will by refusing to perform the accustomed funeral service on the death of Cardinal de la Valette, one of Richelieu's most devoted adherents. Louis and his minister retaliated at once by forbidding the Papal Nuncio Scoti to appear at Court, and commanding the bishops and clergy to hold no communication with him till further orders. The ambassador D'Estrées was, in like manner, instructed to break off all intercourse with the Pope and his ministers.‡

* Le Vassor, *Hist. de Louis XIII.*, liv. xliii.

† Grotius to the Chancellor of Swe-

den, Epist. 982.

‡ D'Avrigny, *Mémoires*, tom. ii. p. 136. Omer Talon, *Mémoires*, tom. i.

The publication of the famous work of the brothers Dupuy, entitled '*Preuves des libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*,' was another circumstance which, occurring at this juncture, served to widen the breach between the courts of France and Rome. It appeared at first anonymously; but the name of the author was no secret, and he was known to write under the patronage and protection of Richelieu. The book was based upon the treatise of Pierre Pithou, but contained a vast additional collection of documents from various sources, which, instead of establishing the franchises of the Church, illustrated the tyrannical excesses and unlawful assumptions of the Crown. Every case was carefully enumerated in which the authority of the Pope, or, indeed, ecclesiastical authority in general, had been attacked with success by the secular power; and these were designated, by a perverse misnomer, proofs of the liberty of the Gallican Church. They were, in reality, proofs of the rise and progress of Erastianism.

Much clamour was raised against this volume by the clergy, and Richelieu found it necessary to order it to be suppressed by the Council of State.* Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, summoning a meeting of prelates at his abbey of Ste. Geneviève, denounced the work as schismatical and heretical; and the other bishops were exhorted, in a circular letter, to prohibit it in their dioceses.† But these measures seem to have had little effect. The sale of Dupuy's compilation proceeded with scarcely an affectation of secrecy, both in Paris and the provinces.

During the year 1640 the rumours of an impending rupture between France and the Holy See acquired still wider currency. The enemies of Richelieu strove to bring him into odium by stimulating the popular apprehensions on the subject; and with

* November 20, 1638. The reason alleged was that it was published without the official "privilege." Grotius complains of this step to the Chancellor Oxenstiern, in a letter dated Jan. 12 (22), 1639. "Quantum hæc evulgatio nocere sibi posset, satis intellexit Pontificis nuntius, multumque moliendo, adjutoribus et monachis, effecit tandem, ut pro rege et regno factus liber, à consilio regio, nomine

regis ipsius, divendi vetaretur. Ita, sub regibus aut ignavis aut ignavis, tantum sæpe fit damni, quantum successores ægrè sarciant; mirumque est pro regibus scribi Lutetiæ non licere, cum Romæ quotidie contra reges et eorum jura libri fiant."—Grot., *Epist.* 1103. Edit. Amstelodam. 1687.

† *Collection des procès-verbaux du Clergé de France*, tom. iii., "Pièces justificatives."

this view a treatise was put forth under an assumed name, entitled, 'Optati Galli de cavendo schismate liber paræneticus.' The author was Charles Hersent, a priest of the diocese of Paris. His pseudonym, Optatus Gallus, was an apposite allusion to Optatus Bishop of Milevis in the fourth century, who distinguished himself by a powerful exposure of the schism of the Donatists. In emulation of this African prelate, Hersent raised the note of solemn admonition against the threatened divorce of the French Church from the centre of Catholic unity. He descanted on the manifold causes of alarm which had arisen from recent events; the scandalous misrepresentation of the Gallican liberties; the continued circulation of Dupuy's brochure, in defiance of the sentence of the bishops and the Order of Council for its suppression; the resistance to the customary payments to the Pope on ecclesiastical promotions—a resistance well known to be sanctioned, if not prompted, by the Cardinal-minister; and a recent declaration by the king concerning the validity of marriages, which was at variance with the decrees of Trent and with the constant practice of the Church. Hersent protested further against the perilous scheme of setting up a Patriarch in France, which, if realised, would place the Gallican Church in the self-same predicament with the schismatical establishment in England. This attack was sternly repulsed by the authorities of Church and State. The Parliament ordered the libellous production of Optatus Gallus to be burnt by the public hangman; the Archbishop of Paris and his comprovincials branded it with unanimous censure, as "false, scandalous, malicious, and injurious to the peace of the realm." Richelieu commissioned several divines to refute the fallacious reasonings of Hersent. One of them, a Jesuit named Rabardeau, published a pamphlet under the title of 'Optatus Gallus de cavendo schismate benignâ manu sectus,' in which he maintained that the appointment of a Patriarch by a national Church is by no means a schismatical act; and that the consent of the Pope was not more necessary for such a step in France than it had been in ancient times for the creation of the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople.* The Roman Inquisition

* D'Avrigny observes (*Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 142) that there could be no offence to the See of Rome in the

creation of the Eastern Patriarchates, inasmuch as it did not deprive the Pope of any part of his jurisdiction as

condemned this performance, and the sentence was officially recognized by the assembly of French clergy in the session of 1645.*

The same occasion gave birth to another literary undertaking of far greater importance, namely the celebrated work of Pierre de Marca, '*De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii.*' The reader will remember that De Marca's high reputation for learning, both in civil and canon law, had procured for him, some years previously, the appointment of first President of the Parliament of Béarn. He now received, through Richelieu, the king's commands to exercise his talents in exposing the sophistries of Optatus Gallus. No man in the kingdom, probably, was better qualified for the task. De Marca's profound acquaintance with antiquity had taught him that the rightful "liberties" of the Church were compatible both with the authority of the Apostolic See and with the independence of the civil power; and that neither the Pope nor the Crown could have just cause to complain, provided the original laws and institutions of Christendom were maintained in their integrity. Such are the principles on which his work is founded;—a work of elaborate and exhaustive research, which has never been surpassed in the department of ecclesiastical lore to which it relates. Notwithstanding all the prudence and discretion of the author, however, it gave offence at Rome; and when De Marca was named, in 1642, to the bishopric of Conserans, he was denied canonical institution. For more than five years his promotion was obstructed, and it was not till he had published a supplementary treatise, in which some of his former statements were explained, some altered, and some withdrawn, that the impediment was at length removed by Innocent X.

Thus dubious were the relations of the Gallican Church with the Roman curia under the despotic rule of Richelieu. Urban VIII., however, though an ambitious Pontiff, possessed considerable address and self-command. He was peremptory

Patriarch of the West; whereas the establishment of a Patriarch in France would have robbed him of an important province which had been immemorially subject to his authority. But if the Pope be (what the Ultramontane hypothesis maintains him to be) *universal*,

œcumenical bishop, the erection of independent Patriarchates in the East, without his sanction, must surely have been an invasion of his rights.

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 636.

in the assertion of his rights, but he never allowed his differences with the French Government to go beyond the reach of explanation and satisfactory adjustment.

An affair of another nature belongs to the same period, which cannot be passed over without notice, though it is difficult to arrive at a complete elucidation of the circumstances. Various theories have been framed respecting them; but, whatever interpretation may be preferred, an equally singular picture meets us of the state of religious feeling, and of public opinion in general, under the ministry of Richelieu. Some of the details, if their date were not known, might be mistaken for legends of the darkest and most barbarous age.

Towards the end of the year 1632, certain strange phenomena made their appearance among the nuns of the Ursuline convent at Loudun in Poitou. Many of them were seized with a sudden and mysterious infatuation. They uttered unearthly cries, threw their bodies into frightful contortions, and practised other extravagances, which led to the conclusion that they were either bereft of reason or victims of a demoniacal possession. The latter persuasion quickly prevailed; and great was the commotion when it became known that the patients, in their frenzied ravings, had accused one of the parish priests of the same town of bewitching them by magical arts. This was Urbain Grandier, curé of St. Pierre and canon of Ste. Croix at Loudun. He is described as a man gifted with many outward graces and engaging qualities, but withal vain and presuming, and of irregular morals. His natural and acquired advantages on the one hand, and his notorious licentiousness on the other, had made him an object of jealousy and ill-will, particularly among his clerical brethren. He had excited envy, moreover, by his talents as a preacher, and had taken a prominent part in defending the rights of the secular clergy against the encroachments of the monks and friars. For these reasons a priest named Mignon, confessor to the Ursuline sisterhood, was his sworn enemy; and Mignon conspired with other ecclesiastics to effect his ruin. Whether the whole story of the possession was an imposture fabricated expressly for this purpose, or whether advantage was taken of the existing disorder at the convent to fix an odious imputation upon Grandier which would be strongly corroborated by his antecedents, it is impossible to determine. Mignon affirmed

that the foul spirits, being duly exorcised by himself and other priests, bore witness to the guilt of the accused; but it must be observed, as a suspicious circumstance, that these exorcists declined to perform that ceremony in the presence of the local magistrates. The ecclesiastical authorities were divided in their view of the case. The Bishop of Poitiers, in whose diocese Loudun is situated, was unfavourable to Grandier;* the Archbishop of Bordeaux, metropolitan of the province, was disposed to befriend him; he sent his own physician to visit the convent, and it appeared from his report that no trace of witchcraft was then visible, and that the demeanour of the sisters was calm and rational. Upon this the Archbishop laid down certain directions, well calculated to elicit the truth, which were to be strictly attended to if the symptoms should reappear. But the preternatural manifestations now ceased for some time, and the plot against Grandier seemed likely to collapse.

Fresh resources, however, were at hand. It so happened that Laubardemont, a councillor of state, well known to be among the most relentless instruments of Richelieu's tyranny, came to Loudun on public business connected with his office. To him the confederates applied;† and by way of prejudicing his mind against Grandier, they insinuated that he was the author of a vulgar lampoon called '*La Cordonnière de Loudun*,' which was full of gross scurrilities against the person, family, and public conduct of the Cardinal-minister. This was one of the crimes which Richelieu never pardoned; and most writers are of opinion that the thirst of vengeance on the supposed satirist was his chief motive in sanctioning the detestable cruelties which followed. Orders were sent to Laubardemont to institute proceedings against Grandier, and that in a form which showed that his condemnation was predetermined. The unhappy man was arrested, and imprisoned for four months at Angers, until the preparations for his trial were completed. On being taken back to Loudun, he was confronted for the first time with the nuns who were said to have suffered from his sorceries. The signs of possession instantly commenced afresh; the fiends

* A few years previously the bishop had been compelled to proceed against him on a charge of immorality; but, on appeal to the Metropolitan, he had

obtained an acquittal.

† The superior of the Ursulines was a niece of Laubardemont.

were furious against the helpless prisoner; they loaded him with execrations, and threatened to tear him in pieces. At length he was brought to trial before a special commission named by Richelieu, consisting of twelve judges chosen from a distance, with Laubardemont as president. The evidence against him was that of the demons themselves (Astaroth, Asmodeus, Sabulon, &c.), procured by the mock exorcisms of those who were known to be bent on his destruction. In vain he urged that the devil is the father of lies, and ought not to be credited even when he speaks the truth. In vain it was pointed out that the spirits contradicted themselves, that they were proved to be false by the application of the general tests enjoined by the Church, and that the means prescribed by the metropolitan for guarding against deception in this particular case had been totally ignored. It was a mere parody of justice. Laubardemont even went so far as to announce publicly that any one presuming to gainsay the depositions against the prisoner would be punished with fine and corporal penalties.

The court pronounced judgment on the 17th of August, 1634, convicting Grandier of the crimes of magic and sorcery, in maliciously causing the possession of the Ursulines and of other persons named in the indictment. He was tortured with unspeakable barbarity, but nothing could be wrung from him beyond cries for mercy and fervent protestations of innocence. The capital sentence was executed the next day, and Grandier was burnt to death on a scaffold in the public square of Loudun, imploring pardon of God, and repeating the litanies of the Virgin, with his last breath.*

The marvellous tale of the possessions of Loudun, though the instinct of our own age prompts us to reject it without hesitation, found credence at the time, and that not only with the superstitious multitude, but with minds of superior enlightenment and culture. Richelieu, according to the account given in his 'Memoirs,'† was fully convinced of its truth. The Jesuit

* See the original documents relating to this affair in the *Archives Curieuses de l'Hist. de France*, tom. v. 2 Serie. These consist of—1. Veritable relation des justes procédures, &c. (by F. Tranquille, one of the exorcists). 2. Fac-
tum pour Maistre Urbain Grandier.

3. Jugement rendu par les commissaires deputés contre Urbain Grandier. 4. Relation véritable de la mort d'Urbain Grandier. 5. Lettre du Sieur Grandier au Roi.

† See *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xxv. (Petitot, 2^e Serie.)

Father Surin, a man of unquestionable piety, though inclined to fanaticism, acted as one of the exorcists. Walter Montague, afterwards Abbot of Pontoise, declared to Pope Urban VIII. that he had witnessed on this occasion proofs of diabolical agency which made disbelief impossible.*

It may safely be pronounced, however, that the possession, if real, was not the work of Urbain Grandier. He was no magician, though unhappily guilty of many other delinquencies. His own undisciplined passions, rather than any more direct commerce with the powers of darkness, would seem to have brought him, by a chain of retributive consequences, to this wretched end.

Of the part acted by Richelieu in this tragedy there is no sufficient explanation. If he believed the case to be one of genuine possession, why did he send it before an extraordinary commission with a man of Laubardemont's sinister reputation at the head of it, instead of leaving it in the hands of the Church authorities, to whose cognisance it manifestly belonged in the first instance? On the other hand, if he was actuated merely by resentment against Grandier as the presumed writer of a miserable anonymous libel, why did he not prosecute him for that offence before the ordinary tribunals, as had been his custom in other like instances? It has been suggested that the Cardinal's object was to give another terrible lesson to the Calvinists, who had ridiculed the possessions as a delusion and the exorcisms as a farce. One thing is clear at all events, that he was resolved upon the condemnation of Grandier; but various questions of detail as to the motives which governed him must remain necessarily without an answer.†

The unfortunate Ursulines were not immediately delivered from their Satanic visitations upon the death of Grandier. Father Surin was commissioned by his Order to continue the exorcisms, and some of the spirits showed a determination to maintain their posts, in spite of all his exertions, to the last extremity. The prioress, Jeanne des Anges, was grievously tormented for more than two years afterwards; and the last of the

* H. M. Boudon, *Vie du P. Surin*, Paris, 1689.

† The sceptical Gui Patin dismisses the case without hesitation as a malicious stratagem of Richelieu's for the destruction of a personal enemy. "La

démonomanie de Loudun a été une des fourberies du Cardinal (et plutôt à Dieu qu'il n'eût fait que celle-la!) pour faire brûler un pauvre prêtre qui valait mieux que lui." *Lettre clxxi.*, tom. i. p. 302.

infernal legion could not be persuaded to decamp till the 15th of October, 1637.*

The imperiousness of Richelieu's temper, combined with the splendour of his genius, gradually overawed the authorities of the realm, ecclesiastical and civil, into a servile compliance with his behests. One of the most marked instances of this was the dissolution of the marriage of Gaston Duke of Orleans, the presumptive heir to the throne, with his second wife, Marguerite of Lorraine. They had been married at first in private, but the union was afterwards publicly acknowledged at Brussels before the Archbishop of Malines. Louis, however, refused to recognise it, inasmuch as it had been contracted not only without his consent, but in direct opposition to his commands; and the Cardinal determined that it should be formally annulled. He is said to have had views of family interest in this matter, and to have projected an alliance between the Duke and his niece Madame de Combalet; but the insinuation seems to be unfounded.

There were two grounds upon which the validity of the marriage was impugned; the first was the civil offence designated by the French law "rapt," the Duke of Lorraine being charged with having unlawfully inveigled Gaston into a connexion which was contrary to the will of his sovereign, and, therefore, to the fundamental laws of the realm; the second was a spiritual offence, the "clandestinité" of the marriage, which, as it affected the conditions essential to one of the Sacraments, belonged to the jurisdiction of the Church.

The French ambassador at Rome was instructed to inform the Pope that his Majesty designed to prosecute the civil suit before his courts of Parliament at Paris, according to the immemorial practice in such cases; but that if his Holiness should think fit to name a commission of French bishops to arbitrate on the religious question, he would stay the action of the secular arm until their decision (which would be virtually that of the Holy See) should be pronounced. Urban declined to take this course; intimating that if he took cognisance of the affair at all, it must be in person, and not through commissioners. Cardinal Barberini hinted his doubts as to the

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 45.

historical authenticity of this "fundamental law of the realm," which was so confidently appealed to; and compared it to the Salic law, the existence of which had never yet been demonstrated from any ancient record.* The ambassador reported to his Government that there was little prospect of assistance from Rome; and Richelieu forthwith carried the cause before the Parliament. The Duke of Lorraine was cited to the bar of that tribunal as a vassal of the French Crown, together with the Princess Marguerite his sister, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, in whose diocese of Toul the marriage had been celebrated. The obedient magistrates, after fulfilling all the requisite formalities, gave sentence on the 5th of September, 1634, declaring the marriage "invalidly contracted," and condemning the Duke, as guilty of high treason, to the forfeiture of all his fiefs. The civil contract was thus annulled; but the ecclesiastical difficulty still remained. A reconciliation was now effected between Louis and the turbulent Gaston, by which they agreed, among other articles, that the question of the marriage "should be submitted to the ordinary authority to which his Majesty's subjects were amenable in such cases, according to the laws of the realm;" the Duke engaging, if the judgment should be adverse to him, not to remarry without the king's consent, while the latter promised that no constraint should be placed upon his Highness's inclinations with regard to any future alliance.† In pursuance of this treaty another attempt was made to induce the Pope to arbitrate in the affair; but Urban was firm. He admitted that the civil contract might be dissolved by civil authority; but insisted that the religious union, resulting from a Sacrament of the Church canonically administered, must remain, nevertheless, intact. Under these circumstances Richelieu applied to the national clergy. A royal message was sent to them at their ordinary meeting in May, 1635, desiring their opinion on the question "whether the marriages of princes of the blood, particularly of those who stand nearest in succession to the Crown, can be lawful if made in opposition to the will of the reigning sovereign." This inquiry was referred by the Assembly to a com-

* Levassor, tom. viii. chap. xxxvi.

† *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xxv. (Petitot, tom. xxviii.). *Mém. du Comte de Montresor* (Petitot, 2 Série, tom. liv.).

mittee of five members—the Bishops of Montpellier (Fenouillet), Chartres, Séez, St. Malo, and Nismes—all well known for their obsequious devotion to the Cardinal. In order to save appearances, these prelates consulted several leading doctors of the Sorbonne—Lescot, Habert, Duval, Cornet, Isambert, and others—and also the heads of the religious congregations, including the Jesuits and the Oratorians;* and the result of their deliberations was to affirm, almost without a dissentient voice, the invalidity of royal marriages under the circumstances specified. Their report to that effect was presented on the 6th of July. It stated that the civil contract constitutes the “matter” of the Sacrament of Matrimony; that this is subject to alteration, and cannot be legitimate unless it be in conformity with the regulations of the civil authority. In default of such conformity there can be no valid Sacrament. The power of constituting “*empêchemens dirimens*” was exercised by heathen emperors, and the same right belongs, consequently, to Christian princes—a right of which the Pope and the bishops cannot deprive them. The custom of France forbids the princes of the blood to marry without permission from the king; and marriages made without his consent are *ipso facto* illegitimate, invalid, and null. And the said custom is declared to be “reasonable, ancient, confirmed by legal prescription, and authorized by the Church.”† The report was adopted, and a decree in the same terms was drawn up and signed officially by the Assembly.

There was, however, one exception to the unanimity of the French clergy on this occasion, which is of sufficient importance to deserve mention; it was the Abbé de St. Cyran. That fearless divine is said to have declared that “he would rather have killed ten men” than be a party to the late resolution of his brethren, which, in his opinion, had “ruined one of the Sacraments of the Church.”‡ This boldness of speech gave sore umbrage to Richelieu, and was one of the offences afterwards visited without mercy on St. Cyran.

* Condren, Superior-General of the Oratory, was confessor to the Duke of Orleans;—a circumstance which did not deter him from pronouncing in opposition to the marriage.

† *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. v. p. 693.

‡ D'Avriguy, *Mém. Chron.*, tom. ii. p. 54.

The Queen Mother, Mary de Medici, who at this time was living in exile at Antwerp, no sooner heard of these proceedings at Paris than she wrote to the Pope, beseeching him not to permit the marriage of her son to be dissolved, and inveighing bitterly against the malice of the Cardinal and the measures of the Gallican clergy. Urban ordered his nuncios to remonstrate; and Louis, in reply, begged his Holiness not to give heed to these groundless complaints, which proceeded, he said, solely from the spite of his enemies the Spaniards, whose interest it was to trouble the repose of his kingdom. He would shortly despatch to Rome one of the bishops who had been concerned in framing the decree of the Assembly, to explain the reasons of State which had made it necessary to procure the recent declaration from the ecclesiastical body. The envoy chosen for this purpose was Pierre Fenouillet, Bishop of Montpellier, one of the most eminent and zealous of the French prelates. His instructions are detailed at length by Richelieu in his Memoirs. He was ordered to avoid leading the Pope to suppose that the king felt himself in need of his sanction for the step he had taken, as if there were any doubt of its validity without such sanction; but to represent that his Majesty was prompted by reverence and affection for the Holy Father to lay before him the reasons which made it impossible that the pretended marriage of the Duke of Orleans could be recognized or allowed to exist; such an alliance being to the last degree prejudicial to the repose of the kingdom, and, consequently, to the welfare of Christendom. He was to remind the Pope of the manifold misfortunes which had been brought upon France in former days through the ambition of the princes of Lorraine; and to state that the present head of that family had surpassed all others in showing disrespect and animosity against the person of his Majesty, from whom he had received benefits and favours without number. He was to express the king's confident hope that his Holiness would not oppose the ancient "custom of France" with respect to the marriages of princes of the blood—a custom which had been approved by his predecessors, and confirmed by ecclesiastical canons. He was to point out that neither the Parliament nor the clergy had done anything that savoured of encroachment, or was contrary to lawful precedent; instancing the case of the Empress Judith, wife of Charles the Bald, who

had been excommunicated by a Gallican Council, which sentence had not been objected to by the then Pope, Nicolas I. Finally, he was to assure the Pope that the king would gladly have submitted the whole affair to the personal arbitration of his Holiness, but for certain political complications, especially the intrigues of the Spaniards, who were implacable in their jealousy and hatred of France; and that such reference to the Holy See was, after all, scarcely necessary, since the relative powers and prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff and the French Government were distinctly defined by the Concordat.*

Fenouillet was graciously received at Rome, and fulfilled his errand with so much tact that Urban expressed himself satisfied, in a political sense, with the course pursued by the French Crown. But he was not to be driven from his view of the indissoluble nature of the marriage considered in its sacramental aspect. The Duke of Orleans, in consequence, continued to insist on the validity of his marriage, though he declared himself perfectly willing to defer to the judgment of the Pope, or to that of a French Council presided over by commissioners named by his Holiness. It was not long, however, before the Cardinal found himself compelled, by various considerations of State interest, to give way upon this question, which had been debated with so much warmth and obstinacy. In January, 1637, an arrangement was entered into with Gaston by which he was permitted to retain his wife, with the king's publicly-expressed approbation, on condition that he would renounce for ever all sympathy with the views and policy of the Duke of Lorraine. The prince accepted the stipulation, was reconciled to his brother, and recovered his honours and domains. Such a conclusion of the affair was by no means creditable to the sincerity of Richelieu; while it left the Assembly of the clergy in a position of awkwardness little to be envied.

The views of the great Cardinal with regard to the exclusive privileges and immunities of the clerical order differed widely from those which prevailed in mediæval times. His sympathies were with Philip the Fair rather than with Boniface VIII. He refused to admit the argument that, since the Church

* *Mémoires de Richelieu*, Liv. xxvi.

is essentially independent of the State, therefore the clergy are exempt from the burden of ordinary taxation for the lawful requirements of the Government. Vast sums were demanded and obtained for various public purposes from the ecclesiastical assemblies of 1625, 1628, and 1635, though not without murmuring and remonstrance; and a few years later (Oct. 6, 1640), at a moment when the misunderstanding between Richelieu and the Court of Rome was at its height, a royal edict suddenly exacted from the beneficed clergy a sixth of their entire revenue for the two years next ensuing. This proceeding was justified on the part of the Crown by reasons which were palpably unfair, though wearing a certain air of plausibility. Richelieu had collected, with the help of the Bishop of Chartres, one of his most trusted confidants, a mass of documents from ancient archives, which went to show that Church property, being held in mortmain, belonged, in fact, to the king as lord paramount; that it might be resumed at his pleasure, and reunited to the domaine royal; and that no religious corporation could lawfully acquire any such possessions except by letters patent, which were granted on the payment of an *ad valorem* duty, called the "*droit d'amortissement*." It was asserted that the clergy had systematically neglected to fulfil this latter condition; and they were now summoned to discharge at once all the arrears which had thus accumulated since the year 1520, when a similar claim had been enforced by Francis I. The debt was assessed at one-sixth of the whole ecclesiastical income for two years; and, accordingly, the Government took measures, without further ceremony, for levying this outrageous impost. No sooner did the royal officers begin to lay violent hands upon the Church's patrimony, than an agitation arose which it is more easy to conceive than to describe. The voice of remonstrance resounded on all sides; torrents of denunciation were poured forth against the "tyrant," the "apostate," who had sacrilegiously trampled on the privileges of the Church, and imposed on her a yoke of servitude hitherto without example. Special prayers were ordered in the churches; strongly worded petitions were forwarded to the Throne; appeals were made to the Pope for his intervention. The grievance resented by the clergy was not so much the amount of the sum demanded, as the attempt to extort it from them without their own consent

in their representative Assembly. They declared themselves ready to contribute their just share to the national exchequer ; but this must be done by the act of their own body, and not by the compulsory fiat of the State. They contended that, in principle, all applications of Church funds to secular purposes were spontaneous, and emanated from the Church herself ; and nothing should induce them to yield, unless the form of synodical deliberation and decision were at least outwardly respected in the present instance. The minister, who was now anxiously engaged in his great struggle with the house of Austria, felt that it was time to offer some concession ; he signified, therefore, that the king would allow the matter to be discussed in a General Assembly of the clergy, which was ordered to meet for that purpose in the spring of 1641. The sittings commenced on the 15th of February at Paris, but they were afterwards transferred to Mantes, where Richelieu judged that his projects were more likely to be received with favour, since it belonged to the diocese of Chartres, presided over by his friend Léonor d'Etampes.

Stormy scenes characterized the sessions. The majority, led by Charles de Montchal, Archbishop of Toulouse, was violently opposed to the Government ; the minority, devoted to Richelieu, were not less resolute, and expressed their sentiments in extravagant language. The Bishop of Autun affirmed, to the horror of his brethren, that all ecclesiastical property belonged to the Crown, and that his Majesty, after making a moderate provision for the support of the clergy, was fully entitled, if he thought proper, to appropriate the surplus. The total subsidy required from the Assembly (including the arrears of "amortissement," and a special grant in addition towards the expenses of the war) was six millions of livres. This was a vast reduction from the original claim of a sixth of two years' income ; yet the clergy refused to vote it, and it became necessary to resort to extreme measures to enforce their submission. The two presidents, the Archbishops of Sens and Toulouse, together with four bishops, were expelled from their seats by order of the king, and commanded to retire to their dioceses without passing through Paris. The chamber, thus purged of its refractory members, consented, on the 27th of May, to pay into the treasury five millions ; and with this the Government declared itself satisfied.

The Pope embraced the opportunity of intimating his desire for the accommodation of his differences with France. The diplomatic intercourse between the two Courts, which had been suspended since the affair of Marshal d'Estrées, was replaced on the accustomed footing; and a cardinal's hat, a boon long and importunately demanded on behalf of Mazarin, was despatched as a pledge of reconciliation.*

The causes which had rendered the Abbé de St. Cyran an object of suspicion to Richelieu were manifold and of long standing. The Cardinal, while Bishop of Luçon, had made acquaintance with him as an ecclesiastic of the neighbouring diocese of Poitiers, and, with the unerring intuition of genius, had at once recognized his extraordinary powers and gifts. On becoming prime minister, he showed his appreciation of St. Cyran's merits by offering him various appointments in the Church. He named him, in 1625, principal chaplain to Queen Henrietta Maria on the occasion of her marriage. The abbé having declined the post, the episcopal see of Clermont was next tendered for his acceptance, and declined in like manner; and afterwards other preferments with the same result. Richelieu was piqued by this persistent opposition to his advances. The spirit of independence was precisely that which he could least understand or tolerate; and he began to attribute St. Cyran's conduct to sinister motives. But he mistook his views and character. That remarkable man was ambitious, but his ambition was not that of common minds; he cared nothing for high station, or wealth, or political influence; but he had an intense thirst for that species of dominion which consists in the authoritative guidance of souls. He was formed to be the oracle of the devout, the superstitious, the enthusiastic, mind; to enthrall tender consciences; to organize and govern a religious party. Such aspirations, as they were gradually manifested, awakened the jealous misgivings of the minister; who felt him to be all the more dangerous in proportion as his sphere of action was mysterious and intangible.

St. Cyran appeared early as an author, and with considerable success.† His first theological effort was a reply to the Jesuit

* *Collection des Procès verbaux des Assemblées du Clergé*, tom. ii. *Mémoires de Montchal, Archevêque de Toulouse*.
Ellics-Dupin, *Hist. Eccles. du XVII.*

siècle. Caillet, L'Administration en France sous le Card. de Richelieu, tom. i. p. 137 et seqq.

† He published, in 1609, a curious

Garasse;* and all his subsequent works were dictated more or less by the violent antipathy which he cherished against the Society. A volume which he published under the assumed name of "Petrus Aurelius" is esteemed his masterpiece; and of this, as connected with a controversy which excited special interest among the Gallican clergy of the day, it may be desirable to give the reader some account.

In 1625, Urban VIII., taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the marriage of a Catholic princess with the heir apparent of the British Crown, had nominated Richard Smith his Vicar-Apostolic in England; who was thereupon consecrated Bishop of Chalcedon *in partibus*, and invested with the ordinary diocesan jurisdiction.† This prelate, soon after his arrival in England, incurred much odium by enforcing, perhaps more strictly than the circumstances required, the rule which restrained members of religious Orders, and priests having no cure of souls, from hearing confessions without licence from the ordinary. The Jesuits resented the prohibition, and insisted that, by special privilege granted by the Pope, they were entitled to exercise their ministry wherever they pleased, independently of the diocesan authority. The dispute grew serious, and such was the animosity stirred up against the obnoxious Bishop of Chalcedon, that at length the Government of Charles I. proscribed him as an outlaw, and offered a reward of 100*l.* for his apprehension. Upon this he made his escape to France, where he met with a kind reception from Cardinal Richelieu.‡

A sharp theological skirmish followed. Dr. Kellison, Rector of the English College at Douai, came forward in defence of Bishop Smith, and of the episcopate in general. He was answered by Edward Knott, Vice-Provincial of the Jesuits in England, and by John Floyd, another Jesuit, who put forth 'An Apology for the conduct of the Holy See in the govern-

treatise entitled, *Question royale, et sa décision*, written in reply to a half-jocular inquiry of Henry IV. as to the circumstances in which a subject ought to sacrifice his own life to preserve that of his sovereign. St. Cyran has consequently been represented by Jesuits and others as an apologist for suicide.

* *La somme des fautes et faussetés contenues en la Somme Théologique du Père Garasse*. This work of F. Gara-se

was condemned by the Sorbonne in September, 1627.

† This latter fact was denied by the Jesuits; but it is clearly established by the terms of the Pope's brief, which is given at length in the *Mémoires du Clergé de France* (tom. i. p. 631), and quoted by Ellies-Dupin in his *Eccles. Hist. of the XVIIth Century*.

‡ Collier's 'Ecclesiastical History,' vol. viii. p. 40.

ment of the English Catholics.' The two last-mentioned publications were forthwith translated into French and Latin, and submitted to the Archbishop of Paris and the Theological Faculty. The Archbishop on the 30th of January, 1631, and the Sorbonne on the 6th of February, condemned certain propositions extracted from the works in question as "rash, scandalous, and heretical." A circular letter to the archbishops and bishops of France was drawn up and signed by thirty-two prelates then assembled at Paris; in which these errors were denounced as tending to disparage and destroy the authority which Christ gave to the rulers of His Church—subversive of the ecclesiastical hierarchy—and derogatory to one of the Sacraments of the Church, namely Confirmation. Some of the statements were even declared to be contrary to the Word of God, the authority of Œcumenical Councils, and the supreme jurisdiction of the successor of St. Peter.* The following may be cited as illustrating their general spirit. "It is utterly false, and of dangerous consequence, to say that there must of necessity be a bishop in each particular Church." "Bishops are necessary for the sole purpose of ordaining priests and deacons." "Members of the regular Orders belong to the hierarchy absolutely, and not in this or that sense." "The superiors of religious houses, since they are properly the ordinaries and pastors of their own communities, are in that respect more truly members of the hierarchy than a bishop who is only deputed to act as such in one particular place." "Catholics who have received the chrism in baptism are perfect Christians in the sense of the Fathers, even though they have not been confirmed by the bishop." Such doctrines sound strangely indeed from the lips of Catholic divines; nor is it any sufficient extenuation of them to plead that they were only intended to apply to "times of persecution." The Jesuits, notwithstanding the censure of the bishops and the Parisian Faculty, kept up the controversy with unabated vigour. They attacked the circular letter, which they reviled as a tissue of exaggerations, containing no one proposition that was strictly true, and many that would be totally false even without the aid of hyperbolical language. "Did the French bishops," they demanded, "suppose them-

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 582.

selves to be more vigilant and more clear-sighted than the Pope and all his Cardinals? The publications upon which they had just passed sentence were perfectly well known at Rome; yet no one there had thought it necessary to open his mouth against them.” The famous François Hallier undertook the defence of the Sorbonne on this occasion in his ‘*Vindiciæ censuræ sacræ Facultatis*,’ and subsequently in his work ‘*De hierarchiâ*.’ At length, in 1633, ‘*Petrus Aurelius*’ made its appearance;—a formidable folio volume, written in a laboured and heavy style, but evincing great intellectual power, a complete mastery of the subject in dispute, and an extraordinary acquaintance with the Fathers and the ancient discipline of the Church. It was generally attributed at the time to the Abbé de St. Cyran, and has ever since been reckoned among his works. St. Cyran never acknowledged the authorship: on the contrary, he usually spoke of it as the composition of another; but there is no doubt that, if not actually penned by his own hand, it was written under his immediate dictation. His nephew Martin de Barcos, who afterwards succeeded him in the abbey of St. Cyran, probably acted as amanuensis, and prepared the work for the press.

‘*Petrus Aurelius*’ was greeted by a general chorus of applause from the Gallican bishops, the clergy assembled in convocation, and the University of Paris. The Assembly sent a deputation to inquire of Filesac, dean of the Theological Faculty, whether he could tell them the real name of the author; in order that they might express to him their high sense of his merits, and offer him some substantial token of their gratitude. Filesac replied, “on the faith of a priest,” that he did not know who *Petrus Aurelius* was; but that since he had thought fit to forego, by remaining concealed, the fame and honour which were clearly his due, he was not likely, in his (Filesac’s) opinion, to quit his incognito for the sake of any pecuniary recompense. He probably desired no greater reward for his labours than to be assured of the favourable verdict of so celebrated an Assembly, and so many distinguished personages.* The Jesuits, upon whom *Petrus Aurelius* had bestowed no small amount of sharp vituperation, complained to the King of this treatment, and demanded that the work should be suppressed; but in vain.

* *Procès-verbaux des Assemblées du Clergé de France*, tom. ii. p. 835.

They continued their libellous attacks upon the prelates and the Assembly of clergy, and were at length called to account for their conduct; upon which they disavowed, without hesitation, the writings of their English brethren, as well as the more recent publications in France; declaring, in a document addressed to the bishops on the 23rd of March, 1633, that the works in question were not composed by members of their Society, and lamenting that subjects so fertile in dissension should ever have been mooted.* The disingenuousness of this proceeding requires no comment. It served its turn, however; for the bishops, though not altogether satisfied, accepted the disclaimer, and the Jesuits escaped further animadversion. The Court of Rome interposed at the same moment to throw its protecting shield round these unscrupulous champions of its supremacy. A decree of the Congregation of the Index prohibited the continuance of the controversy, though without pronouncing any decision upon the merits of the question. All publications relating to it were summarily suppressed; and the faithful were admonished not to write or dispute thenceforward upon these topics, under pain of excommunication *ipso facto*. The Gallican divines exclaimed loudly against this mandate, arguing that, if it were enforced to the letter, many unquestionable Catholic verities could no longer be publicly insisted on;—for instance, that the privileges granted to Regulars may be revoked by the Pope; that bishops are superior to monks; that it is necessary for every Church to have episcopal government; that the baptized are not perfect Christians unless they be also confirmed. And if such truths as these might not be taught authoritatively, occasion would be given to heretics to triumph, and to charge the Church with tolerating manifest error.

It is curious to observe, in glancing at the subsequent history of the writings of Petrus Aurelius, that, although welcomed with such enthusiasm on their first appearance, they did not permanently retain a high place in the estimation of the clergy. In 1635, as we have said, the work called forth warm encomiums from the Assembly, and was pronounced signally serviceable to the Church. In 1641, although the reputed author was then a

* *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. i. p. 579.

prisoner at Vincennes, a new edition was printed by order and at the expense of the clergy; copies of which were presented to all the archbishops and bishops, and to all the deputies of the Assembly. This was resented by the Government; Vittré, printer to the Assembly, was apprehended, and all the remaining copies were seized and confiscated. When the time came for the next meeting of the clergy, Louis XIII. and his great minister were in the grave; and a new order of things had succeeded, under Anne of Austria as Regent, and Mazarin as director of her councils. The clergy now remonstrated with the Government for the indignity done to their order by the violent suppression of a work which they had stamped with special approval; and demanded that the copies abstracted by the police should be restored. This could not be complied with, since it appeared that the books had been thrown into a damp garret, where they had mouldered and perished; but the Chancellor Seguier offered to sanction the issue of a *third* edition of 'Petrus Aurelius.' This was accordingly published in 1646, and was prefaced by a magnificent éloge of the author, in the graceful Latinity of Godeau, Bishop of Vence. "The Gallican Church exulted in this memorable vindication of the authority of the Fathers, and congratulated the writer on having so triumphantly exposed and confuted the errors, falsehoods, and calumnies of his adversaries; thus answering fools, as Holy Scripture enjoins, according to their folly. The clergy knew not which of his varied gifts was most to be admired;—his vast ecclesiastical learning, his majesty of style, his sagacity in detecting the artifices of opponents, his weight of argument in attacking error, his candour in the assertion of truth, his felicity in expounding the abstruse mysteries of faith, his ardent love toward the spouse of Christ, his sincere and unaffected humility."

If, however, we look ten years forward, we shall find that these sentiments of his brethren towards Petrus Aurelius had during that interval undergone a serious alteration. In 1656, France was convulsed from one end to the other by the agitation of the Jansenist controversy; and Rome had condemned, by two successive bulls, that theological system of which St. Cyran was the foremost upholder. The clerical Assembly of that year disclaimed and revoked the acclamations which had been lavished upon Petrus Aurelius on former occasions; sup-

pressed the "elogium" of the accomplished Bishop of Vence and even required the editors of the 'Gallia Christiana' to expunge a laudatory notice of St. Cyran which they had inserted in that great national work. The cause of this self-contradiction must be sought chiefly in the political and religious complications of the time. In 1656, the name of St. Cyran had become notorious as that of one whose unhappy speculation had stirred up internecine strife in the very bosom of the Church,—a strife of which none could foresee the end, and which threatened the Gallican Communion with all the miseries of open schism. Under these circumstances the clergy did not hesitate to abandon Petrus Aurelius, at the expense of their own consistency, in order to avoid all complicity with one who, however learned, however meritorious in days gone by, was now to be looked upon in the light of a dangerous innovator and propagator of heresy. Moreover, it had probably been discovered, on closer inspection, that St. Cyran's views as to the hierarchy were of a somewhat democratic cast; that while he exalted the bishops in their relationship to the Pope, he at the same time exaggerated the powers and prerogatives of the priesthood in reference to their diocesans; fostering thereby an insubordinate spirit and contempt of discipline.

It will be observed that in his great work on the Episcopate St. Cyran espoused the Gallican side, which accorded in the main with the sentiments of Richelieu. Nevertheless, the imputations under which he laboured upon other matters were so serious as to create an insurmountable prejudice against him in the mind of the minister. Besides declaring himself directly in opposition to Richelieu on the question of the marriage of the Duke of Orleans, he had publicly contradicted him on a point of theology relating to the discipline of the confessional, upon which he was especially sensitive. The Cardinal in a Catechism which he drew up for the use of his diocese of Luçon, had stated (according to the ordinary teaching of Roman divines) that "attrition,"* an inferior degree of mental sorrow

* Sir James Stephen, with amusing indifference to the niceties of Catholic terminology, represents Richelieu as insisting on the sufficiency of "*contrition*, uncombined in the heart of the penitent with any emotions of love

towards the Deity." See *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, No. vi., "The Port Royalists." Contrition, in theological parlance, includes the love of God; it is *attrition* that is "uncombined" with it. The language of the

arising chiefly from the fear of punishment, is sufficient for acceptable penitence and for sacramental absolution. St. Cyran combated this, and asserted the necessity of "contrition,"—true and deep repentance, accompanied by the love of God—in order to the forgiveness of sin. And since it is universally acknowledged that by such contrition the sinner becomes justified in God's sight, the inference was drawn, though unfairly, that he did not believe in the efficiency and necessity of the Sacrament of Penance. Thus St. Cyran gained the invidious character of a man bent on overturning the established doctrine of the Church; while his position as spiritual director at Port Royal gave him opportunities of continually widening and deepening the sphere of his influence. But the proximate cause which determined Richelieu to proceed actively against him seems to have been political rather than religious. A treatise had appeared in 1633 entitled '*Mars Gallicus, sive de justitiâ armorum et fœderum regis Galliæ.*' It was by Jansenius, the bosom friend of St. Cyran; and abounded with incisive criticism on the administration of Richelieu, denouncing with special bitterness the unnatural confederacy of Catholic France with the heretical states of Germany. The work found favour in the eyes of Philip IV. of Spain, who, in testimony of the author's services, promoted him soon afterwards to the bishopric of Ypres. In 1638 a French translation of the '*Mars Gallicus*' was published by Hersent, the same who has been already noticed as author of the '*Optatus Gallus.*' The confidential relations subsisting between St. Cyran and the Flemish prelate being well known, his enemies seized the opportunity thus offered of ruining him with the Cardinal by identifying him with an offensive production in which he had no real share whatever. They were fully successful. On the 14th of May, 1638, St. Cyran was arrested at his lodging in Paris, and imprisoned in the donjon of Vincennes. His friends besieged the Palais-Cardinal with intercessions in his favour; the Secretary of State Chavigny, the Bishops of Beauvais and Pamiers, the Duchess of Aiguillon (Richelieu's niece), and even the saintly Vincent de Paul, earnestly pleaded for his liberation; but the

Council of Trent on the subject of | extent ambiguous, and was doubtless de-
attrition (Sess. XIV. cap. 4) is to some | signed to leave the question undecided.

Minister was inexorable. "I tell you," said he, "this man is more dangerous than six armies. If Luther and Calvin had been placed in durance in good time, so as to stop their public teaching, all Germany and all France would have been Catholic at this moment." Father Seguenot, an Oratorian, was sent at the same time to the Bastille. He had translated St. Augustine's treatise 'De Virginitate,' with notes; in which he depreciated the sanctity of the monastic life, attacked the system of religious vows, and broached extreme views on the vexed question of "attrition and contrition." His language on these points is said to have been transcribed verbatim from the writings of St. Cyran.*

Every exertion was now made to obtain evidence to convict St. Cyran of heresy, and thus to destroy for ever his character as a religious teacher. Laubardemont, the Councillor of State before mentioned as deep in the confidence of Richelieu, was commissioned to examine witnesses for this purpose; he commenced his task at once at Port Royal, and received depositions from various persons of both sexes, all apparently of average credit, while some of them were on terms of friendship with the prisoner.

Tardif, an advocate of the Parliament of Paris, Madlle. d'Aquaviva, daughter of the Duc d'Atry, the Abbé de Prières, the Abbé de Portmorant, Caulet, afterwards the celebrated Bishop of Pamiers, and Vigier, Superior of the Frères de la Doctrine Chrétienne, were among those interrogated as to the orthodoxy of St. Cyran; and to these we must add the Bishop of Langres, the Archbishop of Sens, and Vincent de Paul, who sent their testimonies privately to Richelieu. No precise account can be given of the results of the investigation, inasmuch as the records of the proceedings are obviously coloured by the strong party spirit of the day. So far as can be ascertained, nothing was proved against St. Cyran to substantiate the charge of heresy. His weak points were brought to light in the course of the enquiry; these seem to have been intemperateness of language, self-sufficiency, a sovereign contempt for the current theology of his own time, and the habit (singular in a man so deeply learned) of relying too exclusively on St. Augustine, disregarding in comparison the general stream of

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 86.

Church tradition. Vincent de Paul was summoned before M. de Lescot, under a commission from the Archbishop of Paris, and closely questioned as to the contents of a letter written to him by St. Cyran in 1637. He gave his evidence reluctantly, and with a visible leaning towards the prisoner; so that nothing was elicited upon which any serious accusation could be founded.* It appeared that St. Cyran had let fall some indiscreet expressions in disparagement of the Council of Trent, and other uncomplimentary reflexions on the existing state of things in the Church. The prisoner himself subsequently underwent an examination by Lescot in his cell; on which occasion, if D'Avrigny is to be credited, he showed himself no mean proficient in the arts of prevarication. He excused his conduct in one case by remarking that men often maintain in theory principles which they contradict in practice; and that, although he might desire, "by a first intention," the restoration of the ancient discipline, yet "by a second intention" he might judge it right to depart from this standard, and accommodate himself to the prevailing dispositions of mankind. In another difficulty he pleaded that he had employed the figure *Catachresis*, which signifies an abuse of language; and added that if he had sometimes erred in this respect, much ought to be pardoned in one of his impetuous nature, who could not always keep his tongue under control.†

Even if St. Cyran had been guilty of all that was imputed to him, there was nothing to justify his detention in prison; nor was any attempt made to found a legal prosecution on the result of these enquiries. He bore his captivity with exemplary fortitude. It lasted nearly five years, and was terminated only by the death of Richelieu. More than once it was intimated to the prisoner that he might obtain his liberty on condition of giving satisfaction on certain points, especially on the much-contested doctrine of attrition and contrition. But St. Cyran could not reconcile such compliance with his conscience, and preferred the loss of liberty to the sacrifice of principle. During

* B. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xiii. Pt. i. Art. 31.

† D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 107. It must be observed that no official account was ever published of the examination of St. Cyran by M. de Lescot. D'Avrigny's version of it is probably borrowed from that given by

the Jesuit Pinthereau (under the disguised name of De Preville) in his *Progrès du Jansenisme decouvert*. Thus these allegations, being those of declared enemies, lie open to some suspicion. See St. Beuve, *Port Royal* tom. i. p. 510, et seqq. Guettée, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*, tom. x. p. 210.

his confinement he wrote his '*Lettres Chrésiennes et Spirituelles*,' which have been many times reprinted; and he continued to wield, perhaps all the more powerfully because he was suffering persecution, that wonderful empire which he possessed over religiously-disposed minds in all classes of society. It was at Vincennes that he received the visits of Antoine Arnauld, at that time a divinity student preparing for his degrees at the Sorbonne; upon whom his counsels wrought such a profound impression, that he renounced his prospects of professional renown, resigned his preferments, and not long afterwards joined the band of ascetic solitaries who had installed themselves in the cloisters of Port Royal des Champs. Another convert made by St. Cyran during his imprisonment was Henri Arnauld de Luzançi, an officer in the army, son of M. Arnauld d'Andilly, and nephew of the great Antoine. He held an appointment in the household of Richelieu, and might reasonably have aspired to the highest honours; but such considerations were not proof against the rhetoric of the captive confessor. De Luzançi submitted to St. Cyran's guidance as to that of a voice from Heaven; relinquished without a sigh his position in the gay world of Paris, and would not be satisfied till he had obtained admittance among the pious hermits of the valley of Chevreuse.

The formation of a society of men capable by their talents, their learning, their absolute self-devotion, of counterbalancing the power of the Jesuits, had been for years uppermost in the mind of St. Cyran. It was from the Arnauld family, over whom his ascendancy was boundless, that he chose his first instruments in the execution of this scheme. Antoine Lemaître was a nephew of the Abbess Angélique and of Antoine Arnauld. Lemaître, at the age of twenty-eight, had acquired an extraordinary reputation as a barrister, and was rapidly advancing towards the highest dignities of the profession. St. Cyran set his heart upon effecting the conversion of this gifted advocate. He succeeded in dissuading him from an advantageous marriage which would have attached him by permanent ties to the world. This triumph gained, no pains were spared to convince him of the glory and blessedness of a life of devout and ascetic seclusion. By degrees Lemaître yielded to these impressions; and at length the solemn ministrations of St. Cyran at the deathbed of Madame Arnauld d'Andilly, his aunt, touched a chord which vibrated with irresistible sympathy through his inmost soul. A few

months afterwards he resigned his appointments, abandoned his profession, and retired to Port Royal, where he became the first of the famous "Solitaires." Such an example was not likely, in that age and country, to remain without imitators. Lemaître was joined successively by his younger brother Lemaître de Séricourt; by Antoine Singlin, a priest who had been trained under the eye of Vincent de Paul; and by Claude Lancelot, of the Seminary of St. Nicolas de Chardonnet. Others followed after some interval. Isaac Lemaître de Sacy, one of the most accomplished Biblical scholars of the day; the great Antoine Arnauld; and Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, a considerable landed proprietor and the head of the family.

These multiplied testimonies to the force of St. Cyran's genius were not lost upon the Church at large. He was recognized alike by friend and foe as the leader of a great religious movement, which, if it once gained sufficient scope for development, must work important changes, whether for good or evil, in the prevailing system of belief and discipline. While Richelieu lived, such opportunity was rigorously withheld. The Cardinal was keenly alive to the dangers of any renewal of the predestinarian controversy, which had already been so prolific of disorder in the Church; and that especially when it was certain to be complicated with other aims and interests of a far more practical nature. So long as he retained the reins of power, all attempt at agitation in this direction was resolutely suppressed. The walls of Vincennes guaranteed the harmlessness of St. Cyran; and his disciples showed no eagerness to commit themselves to any energetic course of action in the absence of their master. But Richelieu's tenure of authority was drawing to a close. He expired on the 4th December, 1642; displaying in his last moments a tranquillity, firmness, and confidence, which inspired some of those who witnessed the scene with admiration, others with affright.* The situation of affairs changed forthwith. The new ministers, though professing to adopt the principles of their predecessor, found it expedient to relax in some measure the severity of his internal government. Many personages of distinction, who for years had pined in captivity

* "Nimium me terret magna ista securitas!" was the whispered ejaculation of Cospéan, Bishop of Lisieux.

under the vengeance of the Cardinal, were discharged from the state prisons; and among the rest St. Cyran recovered his liberty. He quitted Vincennes on the 16th of February, 1643, and went direct to the monastery of Port Royal of Paris, where Angélique Arnauld and her sisterhood had been so long beseeching Heaven for his deliverance. Next he proceeded to visit the recluses of Port Royal des Champs. A touching account of his intercourse with them on this occasion is given in the Memoirs of Fontaine, who was one of the fraternity, and acted as secretary to Antoine Arnauld.* St. Cyran seems to have been deeply impressed with the belief that he was giving them his parting instructions, and that his removal from the world was at hand. His presentiment proved true; this extraordinary man breathed his last at Paris on the 11th of October, 1643. He was buried at the Church of St. Jacques du Haut Pas; the Archbishop of Bordeaux and four other prelates, together with many lay friends of the highest rank, assisting at his obsequies.

Several prominent actors on the stage of public life in France disappeared almost simultaneously. Louis XIII., his mother Mary de Medici, Cardinal Richelieu, and the Abbé de St. Cyran, all passed away within the space of a single year. Louis was consoled on his deathbed by the ministrations of Vincent de Paul, for whom he had always entertained sentiments of special veneration. Two subjects are said to have weighed heavily on the conscience of the dying monarch; the conversion of the Huguenots, and the responsibility of nominating to the highest church preferments. "Oh! M. Vincent," he exclaimed, "if God should restore me to health, I would never appoint any man a bishop who had not passed three years with you!" Louis expired on the 14th of May, 1643. Throughout life he had been under the spiritual dominion of the Jesuits. Fathers Cotton, Arnoux, Seguiran, Suffren, Caussin, Sirmond and Dinet, successively acted as directors of the royal conscience, and displayed no common gifts of tact and discretion in the fulfilment of their office. It was most probably by the advice of the last-named confessor that the state prisoners were liberated after the death of Richelieu.

* *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port Royal*, par M. Fontaine, tom. i. p. 229

CHAPTER XI.

THE successors of Richelieu were not strong enough to carry on the system of despotic repression to which France had surrendered itself during more than eighteen years. Indeed, it is doubtful whether even the Cardinal himself could have maintained much longer the restraints which he had imposed on the struggling spirit of ecclesiastical discord. No sooner was that stern pressure withdrawn than an ebullition of strife followed, which to the Gallican Church proved full of peril and disaster, and which has left its permanent mark upon the general condition of Christendom. This was the Jansenistic controversy.

Before entering on the details of a contest so memorable for the magnitude of its subject-matter, for the character of the distinguished actors who engaged in it, and for its ultimate consequences to the Church and to society, it may be well to cast a glance upon the previous history of the theological questions which were now to be brought to an issue.

In the early ages, the belief of Christians upon the mysteries of grace and free-will was moulded chiefly by the writings of St. Augustine, that illustrious champion of the faith against Manichean and Pelagian heresy. Not that the Church ever adopted indiscriminately all the opinions of Augustine on these subjects. His teaching was endorsed by the great African Council against the Pelagians, by the decrees of the Council of Orange (A.D. 529) against the Massilians or Semi-Pelagians, and by a remarkable epistle of Pope St. Celestine to the bishops of Gaul* (A.D. 431) to which were appended certain articles or canons on the doctrine of

* *Celestini Papæ Epist. II. ad Episcopos Galliarum*, ap. Sirmond., *Concil. Ant. Gall.*, tom. i. p. 58.

grace.* But the principles laid down in these documents are of a general nature; the Church forbore to decide upon questions which were not considered essential to the integrity of the Divine Deposit. Thus it is affirmed, for instance, that "no man can extricate himself from the ruin caused by Adam's fall by his own free-will, or without the operation of the grace of God." "No man is good in himself, except through participation in the nature of Him who alone is good." "No man, although renewed by the grace of baptism, can conquer the snares of the devil and the lusts of the flesh, except by the daily assistance of God's grace enabling him to persevere." "No man can make a good use of his free-will except through grace." "All good works and merits are the gifts of God; who works upon the hearts of men, and upon free-will itself, in such a manner that every motion towards good proceeds from Him." "Grace avails not only to the pardon of past sin, but also to make us love, and enable us to perform, that which we know to be good." "Grace does not take away free-will, but emancipates it, and makes it clear instead of dark, upright instead of infirm, cautious instead of thoughtless."

Augustine, however, found it necessary, in order to combat the insidious cavils of the heretics of his day, to make a deeper investigation into the problems of the spiritual world; and we need not be surprised if in the course of it he trespassed upon regions which lie beyond the ken of human intellect, and thus became sometimes inconsistent, and sometimes unintelligible.

Augustine does not deny the freedom of man's will; on the contrary, he affirms it; † but with certain qualifications, which leave it doubtful whether he uses that expression in the sense commonly attached to it. He acknowledges that the will is naturally free, but he contrasts this liberty with that which it acquires supernaturally by Divine grace. To the former he seems to attribute only an unlimited capacity for evil; the latter he represents as impelled almost of necessity towards good.‡

* *Præteritorum Sedis Apostolicæ Episcoporum Auctoritates, de Gratiâ Dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio.* Sirmond., tom. i. p. 58.

† *Aug. de Grat. et lib. arbit.*, cap. 2, p. 9.

‡ "Liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit, ad bonum autem parum est,

nisi adjuvetur ab Omnipotenti bono." *Aug. De Corrupt. et Grat.*, cap. 11. "In malo faciendo liber est quisque justitiæ, servusque peccati; in bono autem liber esse nullus potest, nisi fuerit liberatus ab Eo qui dixit, si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc verè liberi eritis." *Ib.*, cap. 1.

In like manner he draws a contrast between the two kinds of grace; that which belongs to the state of nature, and that which is bestowed through Christ under the new covenant. In the original state in which Adam was created, man possessed the power to obey God, and to persevere in obedience, if he so willed. This is called by Augustine the “adjutorium sine quo non.” But the grace required by man in his fallen state—the grace peculiar to the Gospel—is that which gives not only power to obey, but the will also. This is the “adjutorium quo, or per quod, fit actio.”* This latter grace acts upon the will “indefectibly and insuperably,” so that it never fails—never can fail—of its effect.†

This effectual grace, however, belongs to the predestined only, the number of whom is fixed and certain. Although it is written “God will have all men to be saved,” this is to be understood only of those who are foreordained to salvation. These will assuredly persevere unto the end; but those who are not to persevere—those who will fall away from the Christian state and die in their sins—have never been really sons of God, never “separated from the mass of perdition,” even during the time when they lived uprightly and piously.‡

Thus Augustine teaches virtually, if not in express terms, that Divine grace is irresistible. But if so, what becomes of the freedom of the will?

Does it not follow that those who obey God do so from necessity; and, on the other hand, that when grace is withheld, the will is of necessity determined towards sin?

* “Tale quippe erat adjutorium, quod dederet cū vellet, et in quo permaneret si vellet; non quo fieret ut vellet. Hæc prima est gratia quæ data est primo Adam; sed hæc potentior est in secundo Adam. Prima est enim, quā fit ut habeat homo justitiam si velit; secunda plus potest, quā etiam fit ut velit.” “Fit quippe in nobis per hanc Dei gratiam . . . non solum posse quod volumus, verum etiam velle quod possumus. Quod non fuit in homine primo; unum enim horum in illo fuit, alterum non fuit.”—*De Corrept. et Grat.*, cap. 11.

† “Aliud est adjutorium sine quo aliquid non fit, et aliud est adjutorium quo aliquid fit . . . Primo itaque

homini . . . datum est adjutorium perseverantia, non quo fieret ut perseveraret, sed sine quo per liberum arbitrium perseverare non posset. Nunc verò sanctis in regnum Dei per gratiam Dei prædestinatis non tale adjutorium datur, sed tale ut eis perseverantia ipsa donetur; non solum ut sine isto dono perseverantes esse non possint, verum etiam ut per hoc donum non nisi perseverantes essent.”—*Ib.*, cap. 12.

‡ “Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanæ, ut Divinā Gratiā indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter ageretur; et ideò, quamvis infirma, non tamen deficeret, neque adversitate aliquā vinceretur.” *Ib.*, cap. 12.

§ *De Corrept. et Grat.*, cap. 9.

In order to meet this objection, Augustine observes the necessity is not incompatible, in one sense, with the freedom of the will. Liberty is opposed, not to moral necessity, but to actual violence or compulsion. A man may act voluntarily while at the same time it may be morally impossible that he should act otherwise than he does; and whatsoever is done willingly is also done freely.* It is the essence of efficacious grace, that it imparts the *will* to obey God; and therefore although such grace is necessarily followed by its effect, it does no violence to the faculty of self-direction, inasmuch as the just man obeys God from choice, from love, from the impulse of new and sanctified will.

By moral freedom, Augustine seems to have understood simply the natural action of the human will. Taken in this sense, his reasoning is just, for the will can only act by *willin*, to act; it cannot act in contradiction to itself; it cannot help obeying the impulse towards good or evil which is inseparable from its nature. If the essence of liberty, then, consists in *spontaneity*, the will must always be free, even though it be swayed in point of fact by an irresistible necessity. But this is not the ordinary acceptation of the term; it is usually taken to signify *bonâ fide* ability to act or not to act—to move in one direction or in the opposite—to choose or to reject—to indulge or to abstain.

The Augustinian tradition retained for several centuries its ascendancy in the theological schools of the West. But in the course of ages the tone of Christian feeling gradually receded from this system, which was obviously capable of being perverted into a reckless fatalism. A reaction set in, and various causes concurred to bring about important modifications in the popular teaching, though not in the authoritative definitions, of the Latin Church. A large section of the Schoolmen (the Scotists) were strenuous asserters of the real freedom of the will. Their rivals, the Thomists, professed to follow St. Augustine, and in some respects even went beyond him, since they held that God moves the will by a direct impulse or power proceeding from His own omnipotence; yet they taught that grace

* *Aug. De Civitat. Dei*, Lib. v. cap. 10. "Si definitur esse necessitas, secundum quam dicimus necesse esse ut ita sit aliquid, vel ita fiat; nescio cur

eam timeamus, ne nobis libertate auferat voluntatis." Cf. *De Nat. Grat.*, capp. 46, 47, 48.

sufficient for salvation is granted to all the baptized through the ordinary channels; thus excluding any notion which could be taxed as derogatory to the goodness and justice of Almighty God. The great Erasmus wrote a treatise against Luther (his ‘*Diatribæ de libero arbitrio*’), in which he exposed with severity the pernicious tendency of the predestinarian scheme, and advocated views of a more healthy and practical complexion; ascribing the work of salvation primarily to Divine grace, but maintaining that grace may be abused, and that free-will co-operates with God throughout the entire process of sanctification. The Theological Faculty of Paris expresses itself much to the same purpose in one of the Articles drawn up by order of Francis I. in 1542, preparatory to the meeting of the General Council. “It is to be held with the same constancy of faith, that man possesses a free will, by which he is able to act well or ill, and by means of which, even if he should have fallen into mortal sin, he may rise again to a state of grace with the help of God.” *

The movement is further traceable in the records of the Council of Trent. That assembly, among other subjects of anxiety, was embarrassed by the bitter feud which reigned between the Dominican and Franciscan orders. All parties were agreed as to the urgent duty of condemning the necessitarian theory of Luther; but it was not easy to do this without offending the Dominicans—whose favourite dogma of the “*præmotio physica*” coincided to some extent with that of the German Reformer in principle, though they abhorred his conclusions—and giving a too decided triumph to the Franciscans, who professed opposite opinions. Taking these circumstances into account, it will be seen that the Tridentine decrees are drawn in terms which countenance to a remarkable extent the anti-Augustinian doctrine. The 4th canon on Justification (Sess. IV. cap. 16) runs as follows:—“If any one shall say that the free will of man, by assenting to God exciting and calling, does not co-operate in disposing and preparing itself to obtain the grace of justification; or that it cannot refuse consent if it would, but that, like a thing inanimate, it does nothing at all, but remains in a merely passive state; let him be anathema.” Again, Canon IV. of the same session is thus expressed:—“If any one

* *Contin. de Fleury*, Liv. cxxx., § 30, 31.

shall say that it is not in the power of man to make his way evil, but that evil works are wrought by God as well as good not by permission only, but by His direct agency, in such sense that the treason of Judas was no less His work than the calling of Paul; let him be anathema." In like manner when treating of the gift of Perseverance (Sess. VI. cap. 13), the Council declares that "all men ought to repose with confidence on the help of God, since, *unless they themselves are wanting to His grace*, He who hath begun the good work will also perfect it working in them to will and to do. Nevertheless, let those who think they stand take heed lest they fall, and work out their own salvation with fear and trembling."

The gradual change of sentiment upon this question may be further illustrated by reference to the Bull by which Pope Pius V., in 1567, condemned the errors of Baius. Several of the propositions* there branded as heretical are to be found, in terms either identical or equivalent, in different parts of the writings of the great Bishop of Hippo. Such, for instance, are the 25th:—"All the works of unbelievers are sins, and the virtues of the philosophers are vices." The 27th:—"Free will without the aid of God's grace, avails only to the commission of sin." The 39th:—"What is done voluntarily, even though it be done of necessity, is done freely." The 40th:—"In all his acts the sinner is subservient to a predominant desire."

The fact that these and other similar statements had been pronounced heretical and scandalous by the Apostolic See occasioned the utmost perplexity to Jansenius, as he candidly confesses in the second part of his work.† He devotes three chapters to a laboured attempt to explain them inoffensively, and turn aside the edge of the Pontifical censure; but his reasoning is lame and inconclusive to the last degree.

The growing power of the Jesuits contributed to establish a

* Many of these propositions had been previously censured as false and heretical by the Theological Faculty of Paris in a judgment of June 27, 1560. Baius was not mentioned by name in the censure; notwithstanding which he published soon afterwards an elaborate statement explanatory of his views on the point in question. In some instances he approved the cen-

sure; but, as to others, he complained that the Faculty had misunderstood him. He seems to have been a pertinacious upholder of the notion of liberty as opposed, not to moral necessity, but only to external constraint or violence. *Cont. de Fleury*, Liv. clv.

† Jans. *De Statu Naturæ Lapsæ*, Lib. iv. cap. 25.

style of teaching more in accordance with the grand principle of man's moral freedom and responsibility. Without professing openly views opposed to those of St. Augustine, members of that Society held and asserted very generally, towards the end of the sixteenth century, that the human will possesses a faculty of disposing itself to make a good use of Divine grace; that grace sufficient for conversion is bestowed on all, but that, inasmuch as it does not act in the way of positive compulsion or necessity, it may either be complied with or rejected; and that God predestines to salvation those only by whom He foresees that His gifts will be faithfully employed. These opinions were presented to the world in a philosophical shape by a Spanish Jesuit named Luis Molina, who published at Lisbon, in 1588, his celebrated treatise '*De liberi arbitrii cum Gratiae donis concordia.*' According to Molina, the Divine Intellect comprehends three different species or *modes* of knowledge: "*scientia naturalis*," or that which relates to events caused immediately by God himself; "*scientia libera*," which belongs to things depending on His own free will and choice; and "*scientia media*," which is concerned with future contingencies, dependent on the agency of man under particular circumstances. It is upon this *latter* kind of knowledge that God founds His decrees of predestination and election. Predestination, consequently, is not absolute or unconditional, but proceeds upon God's foreknowledge of the conduct of individuals in the use of their natural faculties and of the privileges of their Christian calling.* Thus interpreted, the doctrine of eternal election is compatible with the idea of moral probation, with the unconstrained exercise of man's free will, and with the truth of future judgment according to works. Yet the system of Molina is no more than a plausible approach to the solution of problems which, as all must feel, are not to be fathomed to the bottom by our finite powers. It is open to objection as derogating apparently from

* This was the opinion of St. François de Sales, as appears from the following extract from a letter addressed by him to F. Lessius of Louvain, Aug. 26, 1613. "Cognovi Paternitatem vestram sententiam illam, antiquitate, suavitate, ac Scripturarum nativâ auctoritate nobilissimam, de Prædestinatione ad Glo-

riam post prævisa opera amplecti ac tueri; quod sanè mihi gratissimum fuit, qui nimirum eam semper, ut Dei misericordiæ ac gratiæ magis consentaneam, veriorem ac amabiliorem existimavi; quod etiam tantisper in libello de Amore Dei indicavi."

the sovereignty of Divine grace by making it subject to the independent agency of man; for Molina, while admitting the necessity both of prevenient and assisting grace, yet held that *without* the adhesion of the natural will grace does not become effectual to its designed purpose. He coincided in this respect with the so-called Semi-Pelagians—a school of theology founded in the fifth century by Cassianus and other monks of the Abbey of S. Victor at Marseilles. The teaching of these “Massilians” was in considerable vogue for some time in the south of France; but it was rejected ultimately, as conflicting with the paramount authority of St. Augustine.* It was vigorously combated by S. Prosper of Aquitaine, and was censured by the Council of Orange, A.D. 529. By means of a slightly varying terminology, Molina and his followers avoided the precise formula in which the misbelief of the Semi-Pelagians had been condemned by the ancient Church.

The Jesuits never formally acknowledged the theory of Molina to be their own; but it was natural that they should defend his book, out of zeal for the honour and interest of their Society. The work was violently attacked by the Dominicans and other Augustinian divines; and at length, in 1598, Pope Clement VIII. was induced to appoint a commission to examine it, which took the name of the “*Congregatio de auxiliis*,” as having for its subject the supernatural assistance given to mankind by Divine grace. Years of tedious controversy followed. Clement himself leaned towards the Thomists; and it is said that at one time he was on the point of deciding in their favour, but was deterred by the influence of Cardinal du Perron, who declared that if the “*prædeterminatio physica*” were defined to be the doctrine of the Church, he would undertake to make all the Protestants in Europe subscribe to it.† Clement died in 1605, leaving the cause undecided. The sittings of the Congregation were resumed under Paul V., but little progress was made towards a definite conclusion. This Pope at length referred the questions in debate to two of the greatest theologians of the time, François de Sales and Du Perron. The advice which they tendered to him was never made public, but its

* Two of St. Augustine's treatises—
‘De Prædestinatione Sanctorum’ and
‘De Dono Perseverantiæ’—were di-

rected against the Semi-Pelagians.

† D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i
p. 85.

purport may be inferred from the result. On the 28th of August, 1607, the Pope held a meeting of the Congregation, and announced that their labours were at an end; that he would make known his decision when he judged it expedient; and that in the mean time he prohibited all agitation of the disputed questions, and warned the contending parties to avoid mutual recrimination and imputations of false doctrine. No formal judgment was ever issued. The Holy See, by this wise policy, virtually granted toleration to both systems, on the understanding that nothing should be publicly advanced on one side or the other which contravened the authoritative decrees of the Church, whether ancient or modern. The effect, however, was a triumph for the Molinists; who thus for the first time obtained a quasi-recognition of their orthodoxy from the chair of St. Peter.

Such was the state of parties in this controversy about the time when Jansenius began to apply himself seriously to the study of the works of St. Augustine. That divine had been a pupil of Bains in the University of Louvain; where he had learned both to identify the views of his master with the teaching of the "doctor of grace," and to regard the latter as an exclusive and infallible oracle in the exposition of Catholic truth. During a sojourn at Paris in 1605, Jansenius became acquainted with Du Verger de Hauranne; and an intimate friendship was soon formed between these two young enthusiasts. Their dispositions were very similar; their favourite studies had converged upon the same engrossing theme, and they were well fitted to act in concert for the same objects in the busy drama of life. In 1611 they repaired together to Bayonne, the native place of De Hauranne; and here they dedicated themselves for the space of five years, with intense and indefatigable ardour, to the study of Holy Scripture and patristic divinity, especially the writings of St. Augustine. During that period the plan of operations was devised and matured, by which they proposed to restore to the Church the true primitive doctrine of grace, which for many centuries past (as they affirmed) had been utterly obscured and lost.

In 1616 the Bishop of Bayonne, who had been translated to the Archbishopric of Tours, carried Jansenius and De Hauranne with him to the north of France. The two friends now separated.

Jansenius returned to Louvain, where he became President of the College of S. Pulcheria and Professor of Divinity. De Hauranne was recommended by the new Archbishop of Tours to his suffragan the Bishop of Poitiers, by whom he was made Grand Vicar of that diocese, Canon of the Cathedral, and lastly Abbot of S. Cyran—a dignity which the bishop himself resigned in his favour. His subsequent history has already been detailed in these pages.

The laborious investigations which engrossed the mind of Jansenius were prosecuted without intermission till his death in the year 1638. The fruit of this lifelong toil—the too-celebrated ‘Augustinus’*—was entrusted by his will to his literary executors, Libert Fromont and Henri Calenus, who published it at Louvain in 1640, suppressing a letter written by the author just before his death, in which he had submitted himself and his work, in terms of profound humility, to the judgment of the Holy See. The book soon found its way into France, and was reprinted at Paris in 1641, with the official approbation of six doctors of the Sorbonne. Another edition appeared not long afterwards at Rouen. Richelieu, who, as we have seen in a preceding chapter, had conceived a violent prejudice against Jansenius and his school, exerted himself to procure a censure of the ‘Augustinus’ from the Sorbonne, but without success. The Jesuits, however, made such effectual use of their influence at Rome, that a decree of the Inquisition was obtained in August, 1641, condemning the work, not on the score of false doctrine, but as disrespectful to the Holy See, which had expressly enjoined silence on those controverted questions. Early in the year following Pope Urban VIII., by his bull “*In eminenti*,” renewed the censures of his predecessors Pius V. and Gregory XIII. on the predestinarian errors of Baius, and prohibited the ‘Augustinus,’ as reproducing those reprehensible views. But the decree of the Inquisition was powerless in France, that tribunal being unrecognized by the law; and the bull “*In eminenti*” was for a long time treated as invalid, by reason of an alleged ambiguity as to the date of its publication. Meanwhile the ‘Augustinus’

* The title at full length is ‘Cornelii Jansenii Episcopi Iprensis Augustinus; seu doctrina Sancti Augustini

de humanæ naturæ Sanitate, ægritudine, Medicinâ, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses.’

was read with avidity, and the disciples of Jansenius and St. Cyran rapidly multiplied on all sides.

The Jansenists (they were by this time of sufficient importance to be called by the name which they have ever since borne in history) employed every available artifice to prevent the reception of the bull “*In eminenti*,” both in Flanders and in France. They pretended that it could not be genuine, since it professed to be issued at Rome on the 6th of March, 1641, whereas the copy despatched to Brussels by the Nuncio at Cologne was dated in 1642. This arose simply from the difference between the old and new calendars as to the time of commencing the year. The ancient computation, according to which the year began on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, was in use at Rome, and therefore the 6th of March fell within the year 1641; but the Nuncio, writing from Cologne, had followed the modern almanac, which of course reckoned the whole of that month in 1642.* It was alleged, further, that the Jesuits had gained over some of the officials of the Roman curia, and that by their means the bull had been deliberately falsified. The ‘*Augustinus*,’ it was urged, was the result of twenty-two years’ unremitting study of the entire works of the “doctor of grace;” it was altogether inconceivable, therefore, that it should not be an accurate transcript of his mind. But St. Augustine had ever been accounted the legitimate interpreter of the Church of the West in that department of theology; so that, in censuring Jansenius, the Pope would be contradicting the authoritative tradition of the Church herself. The University of Louvain endorsed these arguments in favour of the late Bishop of Ypres, who had been one of its most distinguished ornaments; and the clergy of the Netherlands, in spite of repeated remonstrances from Rome, remained obstinate in refusing to accept the bull.

Nor was it received more cordially in France. The Nuncio Grimaldi laid it before the Royal Council on ecclesiastical affairs, urging that it should be published with the usual formalities. Several members of the Board—Vincent de Paul among the number †—spoke in support of the bull; but the

* D’Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. i. p. 151.

† Vincent de Paul held the doctrine

of Jansenius to be identical with that of Baius, already condemned by the Church. He declared, moreover, that

majority were of the contrary opinion, and in consequence no action was taken on the subject. Some few French prelates published mandements enjoining obedience to the Pope's decree; among them was the Archbishop of Paris, Jean François de Gondi. "Our holy Father the Pope," he wrote, in a pastoral dated December 11th, 1643, "having taken measures to preserve the peace of the Church in the dangers which now threaten it, it becomes our duty to notify to you his decision, in order that you may receive it as proceeding from that chair where the Divine Spirit vouchsafes His utterances; that you may obey it with all the respect and submission which are due to it; and that those who by the love of disputation, rather than by the love of truth, may have been led astray into contrary sentiments may be recalled by the voice of the Universal Pastor to the unity of the Catholic faith. To this end we do, by our archiepiscopal authority, prohibit the book called 'Augustinus,' lately published under the name of Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, which contains propositions condemned as heretical by the Holy See. Let no man, then, henceforth have the temerity to maintain the opinions proscribed by this constitution."

When the bull was presented to the Sorbonne, backed by a Royal *lettre de cachet* and by the Archbishop's pastoral circular, it was objected to on the ground that it recited certain decrees of the Inquisition,—a tribunal unknown to French law. A committee, however, was appointed to examine the matter. At this moment a pamphlet appeared with the title of '*Difficultés sur la bulle qui porte defense de lire Jansénius.*'* It was from the pen of Antoine Arnauld, who now, at scarcely more than thirty years of age, began to signalise himself in the front rank of Jansenist polemics. The performance displayed rare ability, and doubtless had its influence on the report of the committee. The Sorbonne ultimately decided against the registration of the bull; but took occasion at the same time to forbid all doctors and bachelors to maintain the propositions therein censured by Pope Urban, together with the errors of Baius condemned by his predecessors.†

St. Cyran had frankly acknowledged that the main object of the present movement was to discredit and ruin the Jesuits. See Collet, *Vie de S. Vin-*

cent de Paul, tom. ii. p. 583.

* *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xxvi.

† Gerberon, *Hist. Générale du Jansenisme*, tom. i. p. 150.

These proceedings only served to swell the tide of agitation excited by the ill-starred publication of Jansenius. Isaac Habert, doctor of the Sorbonne and Canon "Théologal"* of Notre Dame, attacked it violently from the pulpit of that cathedral. This brought him into conflict with Arnauld, who, in 1644, published his first 'Apology for Jansenius.' Habert promptly rejoined with his 'Defense de la foi de l'Eglise et de l'ancienne doctrine de Sorbonne touchant les principaux points de la grace.' Arnauld's 'Second Apology' soon followed, in a style of greater warmth and vigour than the first; he vindicated the Flemish prelate with the utmost vehemence from the imputation of heresy, and insisted that his book contained neither more nor less than the pure invariable belief of the Church Catholic. These productions caused a wonderful sensation, and enraged the Ultramontanes beyond measure. Arnauld had composed a third Apology, which was in the hands of the printer, when his antagonist Habert was promoted to the bishopric of Vabres, upon which he suppressed it out of respect for the episcopal office.

Arnauld was never more completely in his element than in the "heady fight" of controversy. While thus bearing the brunt of the fray on behalf of Jansenius, he was engaged in another contest, which placed him in still more direct opposition to the Jesuits. A feud of long standing existed between that Society and the Arnauld family. The father of Antoine Arnauld, formerly Procureur-Général to Queen Catherine de Medici, and one of the most celebrated advocates at the bar of Paris, had acted as counsel for the University against the Jesuits on an important occasion (already alluded to†) in the year 1594, and had gained his cause. This success, the consequence of which was the banishment of the Order from France, was never forgotten or forgiven by the defeated party. Antoine, the youngest son of the great pleader, was born in 1612, and at an early age manifested extraordinary talent, combined with an almost insatiable love of study. He applied

* The "théologal" was a special preacher attached to cathedral and collegiate churches, who occupied the pulpit on Sundays and great festivals, and gave lectures on Scripture and divinity during the week. The

institution dates from the Council of Basle and the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, and was confirmed by the Council of Trent. The theologal enjoyed a canonry by virtue of his office.

† See above, Chap. III. p. 197.

himself to theology, and became a pupil of Lescot ; but after a time grew dissatisfied with the views of that divine, and adopted with intense ardour those of Jansenius and St. Cyran. On this account he met with considerable difficulty in proceeding to degrees at the Sorbonne ; but these being at length overcome, Arnauld acquitted himself in the prescribed exercises to the amazement (*ad stuporem*) of the examiners, and was received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1641. He had been ordained priest in the previous year. In his academical theses Arnauld had shewn himself vehemently opposed to the system commonly advocated by the Jesuits ; but his active warfare with the Institute commenced on the occasion of his treatise ‘*De la fréquente Communion*,’ which was published in August, 1643. It arose from the following circumstances.

A too general laxity seems to have prevailed among Catholics of that day with regard to the use of the Sacraments, particularly those of Penance and the Eucharist. Absolution was dispensed in the confessional upon terms which were practically subversive of all discipline. Even in the case of gross habitual sinners, it was seldom attempted to insist on satisfactory proof of penitence, according to primitive rule, before admission to the holy mysteries. So long as a mechanical round of external ceremonies was duly practised, the confessor laid little or no stress on the necessity of inward purity and contrition of heart. This state of things resulted, in great measure, from the false casuistry and worldly-minded policy of the Jesuits. These Fathers had gained for themselves an unrivalled reputation as directors of the conscience. It was, no doubt, substantially well founded ; but, in order to enlarge and perpetuate it, they had been induced to adopt various maxims and expedients which were calculated to make religion palatable to men living an ordinary life in the world ; to render the outward requirements of the Gospel compatible with political ambition, with selfish indolence, or even with fashionable dissipation. The so-called Reformers, unfortunately, had depreciated and disparaged the visible means of grace. Everything, in their estimation, was of secondary importance compared with certain subjective emotional qualities—the peculiar marks, as they regarded them, of the regenerate mind. Confession and absolution they discarded as unnecessary, if not positively anti-Christian ; even

the Holy Eucharist was valued by them chiefly as an expressive symbol, designed to quicken the moral sense and spiritual affections of the recipient. The Jesuits, in their zeal against these fundamental errors, had countenanced notions scarcely less objectionable in the opposite direction; and a dangerous reaction had ensued. The Jansenists felt the necessity of making an effort to readjust the balance; and their protest was raised with equal vigour against the doctrinal aberrations of Geneva and the practical abuses of Rome in its Ultramontane dress. The movement originated by St. Cyran and Arnauld aimed at restoring the reality and power of religion through the right use of its sacramental ordinances. It has sometimes been imagined that, because the Jansenists agreed with the disciples of Calvin in extolling the sovereign efficacy of Divine grace, therefore the two systems were in all respects identical. Jansenism has been represented as simply another phase of rebellion against the authority of the existing Church; but this is a misconception of its character. The divines of that school clung steadfastly to the orthodox tradition as to the supernatural virtue of the Sacraments, the divine authority of the Priesthood, the power of the Keys, the office of the Church as the infallible teacher and judge of truth; and thus severed themselves by a broad line of demarcation from Protestant sectaries, however designated. They were, in the strictest sense, Catholics; but their ideal of Catholicism was not an easy, accommodating system, which reconciled high religious profession with a life of unrestrained worldliness, but an earnest application of Christian doctrine and Christian ordinances to the indispensable work of man's personal renewal in holiness. If they erred (as unquestionably they did err) by taking an exaggerated and distorted view of the sense of Holy Scripture and the Fathers on certain points of metaphysical theology, all honour is due to them, nevertheless, for their endeavours to revive the flame of evangelical piety among the mass of nominal Christians, and to withstand the flood of Sadducean profaneness which threatened to inundate the sanctuary of the Church.

Such, generally, was the purpose of Arnauld's great work, '*Sur la fréquente Communion.*' The Princess de Rohan-Guéméné, a court beauty whose early life had been notoriously

irregular, had placed herself in 1639 under the spiritual guidance of the Abbé de St. Cyran. From him she received a rule of considerable strictness; special restraint being imposed upon her with regard to certain worldly habits and indulgences which had been proved by experience to be temptations to sin. One day the Princess was asked by her friend the Marquise de Sablé to accompany her to a ball; she declined, on the ground that she had received the holy Communion the same morning, and that under such circumstances the instructions of her confessor forbade her to spend the evening in gay amusement. Further discussion ensued between the two ladies as to the different principles by which each was governed. The rule prescribed by St. Cyran was submitted to F. de Sesmaisons, a Jesuit, the confessor of Mme. de Sablé; and that divine thought proper to publish a treatise in opposition to it, in which both St. Cyran and his system of spiritual direction were severely criticised. Among other things Sesmaisons was rash enough to assert that "the more destitute we are of grace, the more boldly ought we to approach Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist; the more full we are of self-love and worldliness, the more often ought we to communicate." It was to refute this monstrous paradox that Arnauld composed his book on 'Frequent Communion;' one of the finest specimens of close and exact reasoning in the French language. Its appearance has been styled an epoch in the national literature, from its luminous perspicuity and irresistible force of logic.* Sixteen prelates and twenty doctors of divinity stamped it with their approbation, expressed in unqualified terms. It is of great length, occupying nearly the whole of one of the quarto volumes of Arnauld's works.†

The main position for which the author contends is this; that it is not desirable to encourage indiscriminately the habit of partaking of the holy Communion every week; that those whose consciences are stained by mortal sin ought not to approach the Lord's Table immediately after they have confessed, but to abstain for a season, in order to prepare and purify themselves by exercises of penitence. He reviews the

* Bonav. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.* tom. xii. Art. 18.

† *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xxvii.

penitential discipline of the early Church, and shows that the Fathers enjoined, in the first place, confession; next, penance; thirdly, the fulfilment of that penance, extending over a sufficient space of time; and lastly, absolution, to be immediately followed by Communion. If in modern times the primitive rule cannot be carried out in its strict letter, its spirit, says Arnauld, ought at least to be preserved; and other means should be adopted to compensate for that outward penance, which was found so conducive to true and solid conversion. "According to the doctrine of the Fathers, it is no affair of a moment to dispose sinners to receive with profit the absolution of the priest; and something more than words is requisite to satisfy the priest of the reality of a sinner's repentance. The new man is not formed instantaneously, any more than the old; it is developed by degrees, and often a long time passes before it actually comes to the birth. The work of reclaiming a soul to God and rescuing it from Satan and sin, is not such an easy matter as to warrant one in supposing that as soon as sin has been verbally confessed, and a resolution has been declared to serve God for the future, the effect follows at once and of course; that all those chains are instantly broken which withhold the soul from God, that the heart of stone is suddenly transformed into a heart of flesh, and that, whereas formerly all its desires were centred in the creature, it acquires, as if by magic, a will devoted exclusively to the service of Jesus Christ. Others may expect this if they please; for myself, I consider it safer to follow the advice of Augustine and all the other Fathers, to shun precipitate remedies, and to aspire to the higher graces of the spiritual life by the means which Christ himself has pointed out—by asking, by seeking, by knocking; in short, to establish the work of conversion upon the solid basis of a lengthened and serious repentance; keeping constantly in view the admonition of the Wise Man, "An inheritance may be gotten hastily at the beginning, but the end thereof shall not be blessed."*

In treating, towards the conclusion of his work, of the dispositions which qualify the penitent to communicate profitably, Arnauld, in his zeal against the errors he is combating, is

* Prov. xx. 21.

betrayed into a tone of exaggeration ; insisting on so lofty a standard of attainment in some particulars, as to run the risk of repelling, instead of encouraging, the timid and sensitive mind.

Yet, while enlarging on the duty of systematic preparation for holy Communion, to protect the Sacrament from abuse, the author severely reprehends those who through mere indolence and carelessness remain contentedly strangers to the Lord's Table. "When I speak of thus separating oneself for a time from the Body of the Son of God, the better to prepare for its reception, I am very far from excusing the culpable negligence of those who are glad to escape from the duty of frequent Communion under shelter of a religious pretext ; for the same thing is done in their case through an indifference which Holy Scripture threatens with the severest penalties, that with others arises from feelings of profound humility, and from love to Christ as fervent as it is full of veneration. As there was formerly a custom of deferring the administration of baptism, which the Church approved when it was deferred for the sake of long-continued preparation and probation, while it was condemned when men postponed baptism merely that they might lead a worldly licentious life, such as they knew they could not lead after baptism ; so there is a way of postponing holy Communion which the Church approves, when men abstain in order to give time for bringing forth the fruits of real penitence, while the same habit is repudiated and condemned by the Church when it proceeds from coldness and insensibility towards holy things ;—a state of mind so perilous that the Church exerts her utmost energies to withstand it, since it tends directly to impiety and unbelief."*

This brief summary may serve to indicate the general scope of Arnould's book, though it can give but a faint notion of the ability displayed in its execution. The work produced an extraordinary sensation in the religious world.† The Jesuits—although neither their Society as a whole, nor F. Sesmaisons

* Ant. Arnould, *De la fréquente Communion*, Preface, § vii.

† Various answers to it were published, the most important of which were by the Jesuits Petau and Sir-

mound ; that of the former being entitled *De Pœnitentiâ Publicâ et Præparatione ad Communionem*, and of the latter, *Historia Pœnitentiæ Publicæ*.

in particular, was mentioned by name—assailed it with a rabid malignity which knew no bounds. In the teeth of the undeniable evidence of Catholic antiquity, in defiance of the recorded judgment of the most distinguished prelates and divines of France, the indignant fathers of the Collège de Clermont heaped upon Arnauld and his book every species of scurrilous abuse. One of them, F. Nouet, launched from the pulpit of their principal church at Paris a series of outrageous philippics, in which not only the author himself, but the bishops and divines who had endorsed his doctrine, were held up to public reprobation. No epithet was too extravagant for the occasion. “Falsifier of the Fathers, ignorant, fantastical, fanatical, mad, blind, serpent, scorpion, monster, wolf in sheep’s clothing, labouring to ruin the Church after the pattern of Luther and Calvin, under pretence of reforming it;” such are a few choice extracts from the vocabulary of this foul-mouthed orator. The bishops, who were assembled at one of their occasional meetings in the capital, justly resented his insolence. Nouet was summoned to their presence, sternly reprimanded, and compelled to apologise upon his knees; added to which a formal retractation was exacted from him of the offensive language of his sermons, and this document was printed and circulated throughout the kingdom.*

This humiliation did not deter the Jesuits from prosecuting their schemes of vengeance against Arnauld. They attempted to obtain an order from the queen for his incarceration in the Bastile; but without success. Mazarin consented, however, to forward their views by other means; and Arnauld received a royal command to repair forthwith to Rome, and there submit himself and his book to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff.† By way of justifying this arbitrary measure, it was alleged that the agitation which prevailed in France made it desirable to have the affair examined at a distance from home; and that many of the bishops, having already expressed their approbation of the work, were disqualified from acting in the capacity of judges in the cause.‡ But the proceeding was manifestly unconstitutional in every point of view. If Arnauld had com-

* See his ‘Satisfaction,’ in the *Mémoires du Clergé*, tom. i. p. 580.

† *Histoire du Port Royal*, tom. v. p. 373.

‡ The Chancellor Seguier expressed this opinion in the Royal Council. See the *Memoirs of Omer Talon*. (Pettit’s Collection.)

mitted an ecclesiastical offence, his proper judges were the bishops of the realm ; if a civil offence, he could not be arraigned, as a French subject, before any but a French tribunal. Energetic remonstrances were made by the University of Paris, the Theological Faculty, the Courts of Parliament, and the prelates who had recommended the work ; and the Regent, though for a time she seemed disposed to enforce her illegal mandate, at last found it prudent to give way.* Arnauld thus escaped a snare which threatened his personal safety ; for it seems probable that, had he gone to Rome, he would have been consigned to the dungeons of the Inquisition.† As it was, he thought it advisable to conceal himself ; and accordingly he spent no less than twenty years from this time in various places of secure retreat, known only to a few confidential friends. He did not re-appear in public till after the “Peace of Clement IX.,” in 1668.

The Jesuits, conscious that if the principles enunciated by Arnauld should prevail, their own credit as spiritual guides must needs decline proportionably, strained every nerve to procure a sentence of condemnation from Rome upon the book of ‘Frequent Communion.’ Two of their Order, Fathers Brisacier and Benoise, were commissioned to press the affair at the Papal Court, where they were actively supported by Cardinals Albizzi and Barberini,—the former Assessor of the Inquisition, the latter the Pope’s favourite nephew. The friends of Arnauld, on their part, defended him with enthusiastic zeal. The prelates who had recommended his work, headed by the Archbishop of Sens, wrote a letter to Pope Urban (April 5th, 1644), in which they animadverted on the insolent behaviour and dangerous doctrines of the Jesuits, and repelled the calumnies which had been circulated against the teaching of Arnauld. “We cannot conceal what we witness and experience day by day, that certain persons are attempting to establish among us maxims prejudicial to the whole ecclesiastical body, and especially to the episcopal order ; maxims which encourage a deplorable misuse of the holy Sacraments, and which, instead of providing means towards correcting and purifying the depraved morals of the

* Omer Talon, *Mémoires*, tom. i. p. 279. (Petitot.)

† *Mémoires de Lancelot*, p. 272.

age, suggest palliations which tend to justify them, as every one may clearly perceive by examining their publications. So much are they incensed by the recent exposure of a member of their Order, whose views have been refuted by evidence the most plain and convincing drawn from the writings of the Fathers, that they are employing all sorts of expedients for destroying the authority of our judgment in this matter; they decry the doctrine upon which that judgment rests, and strive to render odious the author who has thus faithfully interpreted the ancient tradition of the Church." The bishops proceed to say that they anticipate important benefits from the appearance of Arnauld's work, particularly as a means of counteracting the false casuistry of certain manuals lately put forth, some of which had been already justly censured by his Holiness.*

Annexed to this letter was a declaration by Arnauld himself, who protested that, as in composing the treatise in question he had been actuated solely by the love of truth and zeal for the salvation of souls, so he wished to submit it in all sincerity to the judgment of the Roman Church; of the Pope, whom he revered as the sovereign Vicar of Christ upon earth; of the Archbishop of Paris, to whom he was prepared to pay, at all times and in all things, the obedience which he had promised by his ordination vow; and of the Faculty of Theology, whom he honoured as his mother, and for whom he should preserve through life a profound and ardent affection. "And as I hope," he continues, "that by the grace of God, neither the desire of temporal gain nor the fear of temporal calamity will ever hinder me from defending the truth, so no stubborn attachment to my own opinions will ever cause me to forget in the least degree the entire submission which I owe and will always render to the Church, whose authority I acknowledge as that of Jesus Christ himself, and which is one and indefectible in the succession of its pastors and its Councils, from the first century down to the present, and from this day to the end of the world."†

After the death of Urban VIII., the same prelates addressed

* Alluding to the *Somme des Péchés* of the Jesuit Bauny, which had been condemned by the Inquisition in 1640.

It is satirized by Pascal in the 4th of the 'Provincial Letters.'

† *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xxviii.

themselves in similar terms to his successor Innocent X. They also accredited a doctor of the Sorbonne named Bourgeois, one of the twenty-four who had sanctioned Arnauld's book, as their agent in the affair at the Papal Court. Bourgeois reached Rome in April, 1645, and displayed remarkable acuteness in the discharge of his mission. After protracted delays, he was at last informed that the Inquisitors had unanimously determined that there was nothing worthy of censure in the doctrine set forth by Arnauld; and the Pope assured him, in a private audience, that no event since his accession had given him so much joy as the favourable report made to him in this case by the Congregation of the Holy Office. He charged Bourgeois to inform the French prelates, and likewise Arnauld, of the interest he had taken in the affair, and of his satisfaction at its happy termination.*

By way of compensation to the Jesuits for this mortifying defeat, the Inquisition condemned an incidental expression in the Preface to the treatise on 'Frequent Communion,' to the effect that "St. Peter and St. Paul are two heads of the Church who are virtually one."† The phrase had been inserted, needlessly and injudiciously, by De Barcos, nephew of the Abbé de St. Cyran, a meddlesome person of inferior stamp.‡ It was held to be injurious to the Roman See, which founds its claim to primacy and universal authority on its succession from St. Peter alone; and some reference was apprehended to the project attributed at one time to Richelieu, of setting up in France a national patriarchate, with independent rights derived from St. Paul. Such, at least, was the ostensible ground for taking notice of the passage; but it was probably a mere pretext. The Pope's decree, denouncing as heretical the notion of equal or co-ordinate authority between St. Peter and St. Paul, as joint heads of the Church, appeared in January, 1647; it was worded, however, in such a manner as to be, in the opinion of the Jansenists, inapplicable to the statement in Arnauld's book.§ The Nuncio in France ordered it to be printed without

* See the *Relation du Docteur Bourgeois. Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xxviii. Appendix.

† January 24, 1647.

‡ D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 189. *Histoire de Port Royal*, Pt.

ii. Liv. xi.

§ The obnoxious paragraph ran as follows. The author is speaking of St. Peter's repentance after his fall. "L'humilité de ce grand Apôtre a été depuis imitée par S. Paul, qui est

waiting for the usual formalities; upon which it was immediately attacked as illegal. On the 27th the Parliament issued an arrêt forbidding its publication or execution. These curious proceedings were at length thus brought to a close.

The triumphant acquittal of Arnauld of course reflected new lustre on the Jansenist community. Its effect was seen ere long in the augmented number of the inmates of Port Royal des Champs. Many notable conversions took place at this period among persons of different professions and various classes of society, prompted by a common impulse to renounce the world and devote themselves to God's service in that ascetic retreat:—"like so many mariners," says one of the historians,* "who, having suffered the calamities of shipwreck, find shelter in the friendly haven whither the all-powerful and merciful hand of God conducts them." "God himself," says another writer,† "was the pillar that led them into this wilderness; the way by which they came thither; the guide who brought them there in safety; the hand which supported them there; the almighty arm which sustained them there with celestial manna. In that desert might be seen men of lofty birth clad in the garments of poverty and employed in the most fatiguing labours, with nothing to distinguish them from those placed by nature in that condition, except the noble mien which betrayed them, and the devout silence with which they applied themselves to their tasks. These saintly husbandmen had trodden under foot all earthly considerations. They could reply to those who charged them with fanaticism in the words used on a similar occasion by St. Paulinus: "It is not this garden, but Paradise, that I prefer to the world I have abandoned."

Proselytes were made by the Jansenists about this time from some of the most illustrious families of France: those, for instance,

l'autre œuil de la tête de Jesus Christ, comme dit un Père; qui se retira peu de temps après son baptême dans les deserts de l'Arabie pour y pleurer son péché dans la separation de toute l'Eglise. De sorte que l'on voit dans les deux chefs de l'Eglise, qui n'en font qu'un, le modèle de la penitence." The clause of the Papal decree, limiting the application of the censure, was

this:—"Propositionem hanc, ita explicatam ut ponat omnimodam æqualitatem inter sanctos Petrum et Paulum, sine subordinatione S. Pauli ad S. Petrum in potestate supremâ et regimine Universalis Ecclesiæ, hæreticam censuit et declaravit."

* Clemencet, *Hist. de Port Royal*, tom. ii.

† Thomas du Fossé, *Mémoires*.

of the Duc de Liancour, the Duc de Roannez, the Prince de Guéméné, the Duc de Luynes, and the Marquis de Sablé.

Meanwhile the flames of intestine discord were once more kindled throughout the kingdom. Mazarin, by a series of irritating and vexatious measures, had made himself odious to the nation. The Queen-Regent supported him with blind partiality. The nobles, in their disgust, made common cause with the refractory Parliament, and every day added to the bitterness of an animosity which was shortly to burst forth into open violence. In this singular contest, known in history as the War of the Fronde, the leaders on both sides were ecclesiastics. Mazarin dictated the councils of the Crown; while at the head of the opposition was the turbulent De Retz, nephew and coadjutor to the Archbishop of Paris. Between these two dignitaries there was a deep personal enmity. De Retz had on many occasions thwarted and humbled the parvenu minister; and the latter was keenly jealous of the influence enjoyed by the coadjutor with the parochial clergy both in Paris and in the provinces, who were thus encouraged in a spirit of disaffection to the Government.

The religious disputes of the day kept pace with the political, and were in great measure complicated with them. De Retz was on familiar terms with Antoine Arnauld, and showed himself an indulgent patron of Port Royal. In his administration of the diocese (for his uncle was incapacitated by age) he favoured the clergy of the Jansenist school; and they, in return, were not ashamed, notwithstanding the prelate's scandalous irregularities, to applaud his policy and enlist under his banners.* Hence they gained the reputation, which however was scarcely justified by the facts, of being implicated in all the factious intrigues and rebellious enterprises of the Fronde.† The Jesuits, on the other hand, were firm adherents of the Court and the Cardinal-minister; and thus found themselves arrayed against the Jansenists in civil partisanship, as well as in theological controversy.

* "They forgave his depraved morals," says Fontaine, "in consideration of his many excellent qualities, and his great anxiety to have persons of merit for his friends." *Mémoires de*

Fontaine, tom. ii.

† The Duc de Luynes and the Chevalier de Seigné, two of the military leaders of the Fronde, were among the most devoted friends of Port Royal.

The strife arising from the ‘Augustinus’ now commenced in earnest. Rival Jansenists and Molinists attacked each other from the pulpit; a stream of vehement pamphlets was poured forth on both sides from the press; and it was clear that the conflict was destined to engage all the energies and resources of the keenest intellects of the time. The mysteries of predestination and free-will seemed to have acquired an almost magical attraction; the younger students in divinity, yielding to the irresistible impulse of party-spirit, gave themselves up to the investigation of these vexed questions in preference to all others.

On the 1st of July, 1649, Nicholas Cornet, at that time Syndic of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, addressed a crowded assemblage of doctors in the great hall of the Sorbonne. He said that he had been induced, out of anxiety to preserve peace in the Faculty, to sign several theses* in which it was evidently sought to promulgate the new opinions. He had hoped that such attempts might be suppressed by lenity; and had therefore contented himself with adding to such theses what he judged necessary to protect the truth from injury, and the decrees of the Sorbonne from being violated. He found, however, that his forbearance was abused, and his silence construed as an approval of these heterodox notions. He therefore felt bound in duty to bring the matter before the doctors as a body, that they might adopt such steps as the circumstances seemed to demand. One of the bachelors, whose thesis he had lately had occasion to correct, had totally ignored the alterations made in it, and maintained, in his public act, the terms in which it was originally drawn. He had also caused it to be printed in a shape differing from that which he (the Syndic) approved. Such insubordination was not to be endured. Respect for authority must be enforced; and to this end he suggested that the Sorbonne should record its judgment upon certain propositions which he had drawn up, after mature consideration, as expressing the sum and substance of the views in question. He proceeded to specify seven, which were afterwards reduced to five, as follows.†

* Public exercises on various subjects of philosophy, theology, canon law, or arts, sustained by candidates for degrees in the Universities.

† They stood thus in the original Latin:—

1. “*Aliqua Dei præcepta hominibus justis volentibus et conantibus, secun-*

1. "Certain commandments of God are impossible to just persons even desiring and endeavouring to keep them, according to the strength which they then possess; and such grace is lacking to them as would render them possible."

2. "In the state of fallen nature internal grace is never resisted."

3. "In order to merit and demerit in the state of fallen nature, freedom from necessity is not required of man, but it suffices that there be freedom from constraint."

4. "The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of internal prevenient grace for each separate act, and even for the beginning of faith; their heresy consisted in this, that they considered that grace to be such as the will of man might either resist or obey."

5. "It is a Semi-Pelagian error to say that Christ died or shed His blood for all men absolutely."

A sharp discussion ensued upon the question whether these propositions should be submitted to an official examination. It was decided at length in the affirmative by a plurality of voices; and a Committee was appointed to consider and report upon them, the members of which, with only two exceptions, were known to be hostile to Jansenius.*

It is to be observed that the Syndic neither named any author, nor specified any work from which the propositions were extracted. Indeed when one of the doctors remarked that the intention was evidently to condemn Jansenius, Cornet replied with warmth, "*Non agitur de Jansenio.*" Yet we know that in the sequel these very propositions were continually referred to as containing the pith and marrow of the Jansenist heresy, and that they were anathematized as such by the Apostolic See.

The Jansenists took the alarm at once, and put forth several

dum præsentes quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deest quoque iis gratia quâ possibilia fiant."

2. "Interiori gratiæ in statu naturæ lapsæ nunquam resistitur."

3. "Ad merendum et demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ non requiritur in homine libertas à necessitate, sed sufficit libertas à coactione."

4. "Semi-Pelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem

ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; et in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse cui posset humana voluntas resistere vel obtemperare."

5. "Semi-Pelagianorum error est dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse."

* *Journal de Saint Amour*, Part i. chap. 6.

pamphlets in which the tactics of their opponents were unsparingly criticised. The most forcible of these, entitled 'Considerations sur l'entreprise de Maître Nicolas Cornet, Syndic de la Faculté,' was by Antoine Arnauld;* who maintained that the propositions were mere fabrications, and that such opinions had never in fact been held or taught by any one. They were drawn up, he declared, in language so ambiguous, that they might be interpreted at pleasure either in a heretical or in an orthodox sense. Moreover, the Syndic and his friends had violated the rules of the Sorbonne by denouncing the propositions without mentioning the name of the author, or the works from which they were quoted. It was manifest, he contended, that their object was to cast discredit on the teaching of St. Augustine; several of them having already expressed their dissent in many particulars from that Father's views.

Meanwhile a strong minority of the doctors, headed by Louis de St. Amour, signed an "appel comme d'abus" to the Parliament against the proceedings of the Theological Faculty. They entrusted it for presentation to Broussel, a highly popular magistrate, the same whose arrest, in August, 1648, had given the signal for the outbreak against Mazarin and the Government.† Thus early commenced the alliance, intelligible and natural under the circumstances, between the Jansenists and the party of political disaffection.

The appeal was duly admitted, but on the suggestion of the First President, Mathieu Molé, it was arranged that no further action should be taken for three or four months ensuing; in the hope that during that interval an accommodation might be agreed to, and peace restored. The truce, however, was ill observed by the Molinists. About the middle of September a document was circulated in Paris purporting to be a censure passed by the Committee of Doctors on the five Propositions, and signed by eight out of the ten members who composed it.‡ Upon this St. Amour and his supporters again appealed to the law courts. The parties were summoned before the "chambre des vacations" on the 5th of October, and Cornet and his friends

* *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xix. 4to. 1778.

† D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 197.

‡ This paper is given at length, under the title of 'Propositiones Baccalaureorum,' by Gerberon, *Hist. du Jansenisme*, tom. i. p. 312.

protested that the circular complained of had been published without their knowledge or consent. The presiding judge now made another attempt to effect a reconciliation; but finding it impracticable, he ordered the appeal to be heard at the first sitting of the Courts in November, and meanwhile forbade the parties to publish anything whatever on the subject, or agitate the question directly or indirectly.

The opponents of Jansenius now changed their plan of operations. From the temper manifested by the Parliament, the threatening aspect of public affairs, and the wide-spread prejudice against the Jesuits, there was reason to apprehend that the attempt to obtain a censure of the propositions from the Sorbonne would have been defeated. They therefore abandoned that project; contenting themselves with reminding the Faculty that it had already passed decrees upon the subject, and that nothing more was needed than that the Syndic should enforce their execution. The surreptitious form of censure, however, which Cornet and his colleagues had disavowed before the magistrates, was transmitted to Rome, where it was dealt with as if it had been a genuine act of the Sorbonne. Commissioners were named to examine it, and it seems that their report would have confirmed it, but for the opposition of one of them, the Cardinal de St. Clément, a Dominican.* The antipathy of the Dominicans to the Jesuits had been much intensified since the appearance of the famous work of Molina, which they regarded as an audacious attack upon the authority of St. Augustine and the doctrine of efficacious grace. The Pope accordingly abstained from giving a decision.

In the next stage of the contest the initiative was taken by the prelates of France;—a large body of whom appealed to the Pope for the purpose of prevailing on his Holiness to deliver an authoritative judgment on the merits of the Five Propositions. Their joint letter was drawn up by Habert Bishop of Vabres (the same who in 1643 had denounced the ‘Augustinus’ from the pulpit of Notre Dame), and is said to have been cordially approved by Vincent de Paul.† The document, which bore

* Gerberon, *Hist. du Jansenisme*, tom. i. p. 330.

† Vincent de Paul exerted himself zealously in persuading the bishops to affix their names to the letter. In con-

sequence he is bitterly reviled by the Jansenist historian Gerberon. “Frondeur aussi ignorant que zélé”—“dévot ignorant”—“demi Pelagien”—are among the epithets bestowed on him.

the signature of eighty-five bishops, possesses so much historic interest, that a translation of it is here presented to the reader.

“It is an established usage of the Church, most holy Father, that the greater causes shall be referred to the Apostolic See; and the faith of Peter, which can never fail, demands that this usage be for ever continued as a matter of right. In obedience to so just a law, we deem it necessary to address your Holiness upon an affair of the gravest importance to religion. For ten years past we have seen with much grief France agitated by violent contentions on account of the posthumous work of the reverend Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, and the doctrine therein contained. These commotions ought indeed to have been suppressed as well by the authority of the Council of Trent as by that of the bull of Urban VIII., of happy memory, by which that Pontiff condemned the dogmas of Jansenius, and confirmed the decrees of Pius V. and Gregory XIII. against Baius. Your Holiness has established, by a fresh decree, the truth and the force of the bull; but because each individual proposition was not branded by a special censure, it has appeared to certain persons that room was still left for subterfuge and evasion. Such resources will, we believe, be altogether cut off, if it shall please your Holiness, according to this our petition, to pronounce clearly and definitely what sentiments are to be held upon this subject. With this view, we implore your Holiness to undertake the examination of the following propositions, the discussion of which is the chief source of the alarming excitement now prevailing, and to deliver a distinct judgment upon each of them.”

Here follow the Five Propositions, the text of which has been already given. The bishops continue:—“Your Holiness has had recent proof of the efficacy which attends the authoritative decisions of the Apostolic See, in the overthrow of the error of the double head of the Church. The storm ceased immediately; the winds and waves submitted to the voice and command of Jesus Christ. For which reason we entreat you, most holy Father, to publish a decisive judgment on the aforesaid propositions;—a judgment to which the reverend Jansenius himself, when at the point of death, expressly submitted his work; and by this means to dispel all obscurity, to re-assure wavering minds, to avert divisions, and to restore to the Church her peace

and her prosperity. While cherishing this anticipation, we address our desires and prayers to God, that the immortal King may bless your Holiness with long and happy years, and in the end with a glorious eternity.” *

Exception was taken to this proceeding by a portion of the French clergy, first, on the ground that the signatures had been obtained by underhand and unfair means; and secondly, as interfering with the right of the episcopate to take cognizance, in the first instance, of the greater ecclesiastical causes, previously to any application to Rome. The Archbishop of Embrun, with some of his brethren, waited on the Nuncio to inform him that they disapproved the step, and that it must not be considered the collective act of the clergy of France. They likewise presented a counter-address to the Pope, setting forth at considerable length their view of the affair. The Five Propositions, they observed, being ambiguously worded, could not but engender disputes full of animosity, from the conflicting interpretations which must inevitably be applied to them. There were, moreover, other reasons for thinking that the present was not a favourable moment for determining the questions of grace and predestination—beset as they were with difficulties, and never agitated without violent contests. In such a case the order of the Church Universal, combined with the customs received in the National Church of France, ought to be scrupulously observed; and to this end the case ought to be brought in the first instance before the council of bishops, according to various precedents, which they cited, both ancient and modern. Had this course been taken, it would have been the duty of the bishops to examine whether the propositions had not been fabricated in order to stigmatize certain individuals, and excite commotion; to ascertain in what place, by what writers, and in what sense, they had been advanced; to distinguish their real meaning from the false; to inquire closely into all that had passed upon the subject since the dispute commenced; to give a full and impartial hearing to all parties in the case; and after all this, to make known to his Holiness the result of their investigation. Whereas the measure adopted by their colleagues left an opening for artifice, for calumny, for misrepresentation,

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 223,

for deception, which might lead to consequences deeply prejudicial to the cause of truth. They therefore implored the holy Father either to permit this grave controversy, which had already lasted several centuries without impairing Catholic unity, to remain still longer undecided, or to determine the questions submitted to him in accordance with the prescriptive rules of ecclesiastical discipline. This letter was signed by the Archbishop of Sens (Louis Henri de Gondrin), and by the Bishops of Orleans, Chalons, Lescar, Agen, Comminges, Amiens, Angers, Beauvais, and St. Papoul.*

The request of the eighty-five prelates could hardly be disregarded by the Pope; who accordingly appointed a commission of six cardinals to proceed to the examination of the propositions. The commissioners met for the first time on the 20th of April, 1651, under the presidency of Cardinal Roma, Dean of the Sacred College; but their sittings were not held regularly till the spring of the year following. Each party in the cause deputed certain divines as its agents and advocates at the Papal Court on this occasion. These were, on the side of the eighty-five prelates, whom we may call the appellants, MM. Hallier (who had recently succeeded Cornet as Syndic of the Sorbonne), Legault, and Joysel; on the opposite side, Gorin de Saint Amour (who has left a very interesting chronicle of the events of his mission †), La Lanne, Abbot of Valcroissant, and afterwards the celebrated Father Desmares of the Oratory.

A discussion arose at the outset as to the method in which the inquiry should be conducted. The Jansenists desired to have the matter at issue argued by public disputation between themselves and their opponents, as the best means of ascertaining what was really maintained on each side, and fixing the precise sense of the propositions, which they affirmed to be equivocal. This demand was resisted by the Jesuits; and they succeeded in inducing the Pope and Cardinals to adopt the course which they preferred. The respondents, indeed, had an exceedingly difficult part to play. The Pope received them graciously, and assured them that whatever might be the final decision, it

* *Journal de St. Amour*, Part iii. chap. 1. D'Avrigny, *Mémoires*, tom. ii. p. 252.

† St. Amour's 'Journal' was placed

on the Index by the authorities of the Inquisition, and the French Government ordered it to be publicly burnt by the hangman.

would by no means militate against the teaching either of St. Augustine or St. Thomas Aquinas as to the efficaciousness of grace. Nevertheless, it was plain that the curia was strongly prejudiced against them. They strove to organize a friendly party among the religious Orders, especially the Augustinians and Dominicans; urging that a conspiracy had been formed to subvert the vital doctrine of efficacious grace, and that all who were anxious to preserve it ought to join heart and hand forthwith with the defenders of Jansenius. To some extent this attempt was successful; several Dominicans supported the Jansenist cause in the meetings of the Congregation, and pronounced in favour of the Propositions when the suffrages were collected. Others, however, having been re-assured upon the point which had caused alarm, voted for a condemnation. A complaint was raised, again, and with some reason, against the composition of the commission. It consisted, as finally arranged, of five cardinals and thirteen "consulters" or assessors, chosen from the most eminent theologians of the monastic orders. Two of these, Modeste, a Franciscan, and Pallavicini, a Jesuit, had declared themselves decidedly opposed to the 'Augustinus.' The Jansenist deputies objected in consequence to their sitting on the commission, and also to the presence of Cardinal Albizzi, who acted as secretary; but their appeal was disregarded. Other vexatious obstacles were thrown in their way; but the chief grievance was the determined refusal to confront them publicly with their antagonists, for the purpose of elucidating those terms and phrases in the controversy which (according to the Jansenists) were of dubious import.

The judicial investigation was conducted with laudable zeal and energy. Twenty sessions were held between the 1st of October, 1652, and the 20th of January, 1653; five of which were devoted to the consideration of the first Proposition, four to the second, four to the third, three to the fourth, and four to the fifth. The meetings took place latterly, by the Pope's express desire, in his own presence. His Holiness, notwithstanding his great age, attended ten sittings, each of four hours' duration, and spared no pains to make himself master of the intricate technicalities of the question in debate.

On the 19th of May, 1653, the Jansenist deputies were received in solemn audience by Pope Innocent and the whole

Congregation. La Lanne and Desmares harangued them for several hours; the latter exhibiting on the occasion all the qualities of a consummate orator. They founded their argument specially on a document which became known as the ‘*Écrit à trois colonnes*;’* in which they had drawn up side by side three different interpretations of the Five Propositions. The first column contained the Calvinist sense, which all Catholics agreed in repudiating; the second gave the view which the Jansenists maintained to be the legitimate, orthodox, and true one; the third exhibited the so-called Molinist or Semi-Pelagian version, which was attributed to the Jesuits. By dint of much ingenious extenuation, many fine-drawn distinctions, and no small distortion of the plain meaning of words, the advocates of Jansenius modified the harshness of the text of the Propositions, and showed that they *might* be so construed as to exclude the necessitarian theory. But they made no real impression upon the minds of their judges. It was nothing to the purpose to urge that the Propositions were susceptible of a non-natural signification, differing from that which appeared upon their surface. The Pope was not called upon to decide whether they were *capable* of being understood in a Calvinist, a Jansenist, or a Molinist sense; but whether, taken in their obvious, grammatical, and literal acceptation, they were or were not agreeable to the Catholic faith.

The Jansenists relied with unbounded confidence on the identity of doctrinal teaching (which, according to them, was complete and indisputable) between Jansenius and St. Augustine. If they could establish this, nothing more was needed, they conceived, in order to make victory secure. Yet St. Augustine, however brilliant the prestige attaching to his name, was not infallible;—so far from it, that sentiments of a conflicting tendency, and scarcely capable of reconciliation, may be gathered, as has been already noticed, from different parts of his voluminous writings. Under such circumstances, it is manifest that the Church was not bound to accept a theological statement or a metaphysical theory merely because it might be supported by sporadic quotations from the works of St. Augustine. The

* See this document—“*Brevissima sus distinctio*”—in D’Argentré, *Collect. Quinque Propositionum in varios sen-* | *Judic.*, tom. iii. p. 263.

Church, it need scarcely be said, had never adopted any individual theologian as her exclusive oracle. Augustine had defended certain broad, general principles on the subject of Divine grace, with regard to which he was justly honoured throughout Christendom as a pillar of orthodoxy; but he had also hazarded speculations upon other matters—matters of abstruse detail—as to some of which no authoritative judgment had been pronounced at all, while there were instances in which the voice of authority had been adverse to Augustine. The extent to which the Church had accepted him as the exponent of her mind had been distinctly indicated by the Council of Trent; so that it was vain to imagine that the Pope could sanction any tenets propounded in his name which were at variance with the Tridentine definitions.

That the Propositions were opposed to the decrees of Trent is at once apparent on comparing them with Chapters V.—XIII. of the VIth. Session of that Council. Hence the Pope and his Congregation were fully warranted in declaring that they did not represent the real views of St. Augustine; inasmuch as the Church had determined, in and by those very decrees, the true sense in which that Father was to be understood by Catholics. Thus it was quite possible to convict the bishop of Ypres of false doctrine without thereby inflicting any similar stigma upon the Bishop of Hippo;—a contingency which, singularly enough, seems never to have entered into the calculations of La Lanne and his associates. Their chief anxiety, according to their own account, was, not so much to prevent the Propositions from being condemned, for they acknowledged that in a certain sense they deserved condemnation; but to prevent their being condemned in such a sense as would involve a censure of St. Augustine, or (what in their view was the same thing) of Jansenius. They insisted that the Propositions, rightly interpreted, were orthodox; taken in a different sense, they admitted them to be heretical, but they denied that this latter construction was the true one. Such special pleading would go far to preclude the condemnation of doctrinal error in any shape whatever; for few statements are so hopelessly heterodox as to be incapable of being transformed, under a process of dexterous manipulation, into comparative harmlessness. The position that “certain precepts of the Divine law cannot possibly be fulfilled by Christians, though they may

desire and endeavour to do so," is one which shocks the first instincts of a religious mind; and the idea, thus expressed, is inevitably rejected as false. Such language may perhaps be explained; but only by explaining it away. The same may be said of the dogma that "man never resists internal grace"—that "actions may be meritorious, or the contrary, even when they are done under necessity"—and that "our Saviour did not shed His blood for all mankind." Thus coarsely enunciated, they, as it were, refute themselves, and are clearly untenable. Augustine, very possibly, may have given apparent countenance to similar opinions, especially in some of his earlier works; but his language is guarded and measured, if not ambiguous;* whereas the conclusions drawn by Jansenius were indiscreet and violent in the extreme. This fact had a decisive bearing upon the ultimate judgment at Rome. The Pope and his advisers drew a line of separation, sharply and strongly, between Jansenius and St. Augustine. The disciple they branded with heresy; but the credit and fame of the master—so immemorally cherished throughout the Christian world—were left altogether intact.

* The following passage, so often referred to by Jansenius and his partisans, was greatly overstrained by them, if not altogether misinterpreted. "Ad hoc valet quod scriptum est, si volueris, conservabis mandata; ut homo qui voluerit et non potuerit, nondum se plenè velle cognoscat, et oret ut habeat tantam voluntatem quanta sufficit ad implenda mandata. Sic quippe adjuvatur ut faciat quod jubetur. . . . Non juberet Deus quod sciret non posse ab homine fieri. Quis hoc nesciat? Sed idè jubet aliqua quæ non possumus, ut noverimus quid ab illo petere debeamus. Ipsa est enim fides, quæ orando impetrat quod lex imperat." *Aug. De Grat. et Lib. Arbitr.*, capp. 15, 16. Upon this Jansenius comments as follows:—"Nihil est in doctrinâ Sancti Augustini certius et fundatius, quàm esse præcepta quædam quæ hominibus non tantum infidelibus, excæcatis, obduratis, sed fidelibus quoque et

justis, volentibus, et conantibus secundum præsentem quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deesse quoque gratiam quâ fiant possibilia." (Jansen. 'Augustin.', tom. iii. Lib. iii. cap. 13.) And again; "Cum plurimi non petant gratiam illam quâ possint ac sufficiant præcepta facere; vel non ita petant ut ad impetrandum necessarium est; nec omnibus gratiam vel ferventer petendi, vel omnino petendi Deus largiatur, apertissimum est multis fidelibus deesse illam sufficientem gratiam, et consequenter illam perpetuam, quam quidam prædicant, faciendi præcepti facultatem." (*Ib.* circa finem.) Such statements prove pretty clearly, on the one hand, that the Five Propositions were really held by Jansenius; while, on the other, they make it questionable whether Jansenius can be taken as a faithful exponent of the mind of St. Augustine.

CHAPTER XII.

THE decision was finally taken on the eve of Whitsunday, the 31st of May, 1653; and eight days afterwards the bull "*Cum occasione*" was promulgated at Rome with the customary formalities. "Whereas" (such is its tenor), "on the occasion of the printing of a work entitled the *Augustinus* of Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, among other opinions of that author a controversy arose, principally in France, respecting five of them; many of the Gallican bishops pressed us to enter into an examination of the said contested opinions, and to pronounce a definite judgment concerning each of them. We, who amid the manifold cares which continually trouble our mind, are anxious above all things that the Church of God committed to us may be delivered from pernicious errors which threaten its safety, and, like a ship on a tranquil sea, may pursue its course peacefully, and attain the wished-for haven of salvation; considering the importance of the case, have caused the aforesaid propositions to be diligently examined, one by one, by several learned doctors in theology, in the presence of certain Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, specially and frequently assembled for that purpose. We have maturely reviewed their suffrages, given both *vivâ voce* and in writing, and have heard the said doctors discourse at length upon the propositions, and on each one of them separately; many congregations having been held in our presence. From the commencement of these discussions we directed prayers, both public and private, to be offered for the Divine assistance, and have latterly caused them to be renewed with increased fervour. At length, by the favour and guidance of the Holy Spirit, we have arrived at the following declaration and definition.

"As to the first of these propositions, 'Certain commandments of God are impossible to just persons who desire and endeavour to obey them, as regards the strength they then possess, and such grace is denied them as would enable them to perform

them ;' we declare it to be rash, impious, blasphemous, heretical, and as such we condemn it.

"The second, 'In the state of corrupt nature internal grace is never resisted'—we declare heretical, and condemn it as such.

"The third—'In order to merit and demerit in the state of fallen nature, there is no need of liberty exempt from necessity, but freedom from actual compulsion is sufficient'—we declare heretical, and as such we condemn it.

"The fourth—'The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of internal and prevenient grace for every action in particular, even for the first beginning of faith ; their heresy consisted in maintaining that this grace is such that man's will can either resist it or obey it'—we declare to be false and heretical, and as such we condemn it.

"The fifth—'It is a Semi-Pelagian error to say that Jesus Christ died, or shed His blood, for all men without exception'—we declare to be false, rash, scandalous ; and if understood in the sense that Christ died for the predestined only, we declare it impious, blasphemous, derogatory to the goodness of God, heretical, and as such we condemn it.

"In consequence, the faithful of both sexes are forbidden, under all the pains and penalties denounced against heretics and their abettors, to believe, teach, or preach concerning the said propositions otherwise than the present constitution directs ; and the diocesan ordinaries are enjoined to put the laws of ecclesiastical discipline in force against all offenders." To guard against misconception, the Bull states in conclusion that the condemnation of these particular errors is not to be taken as conveying by implication any approval of other opinions contained in the writings of Jansenius.

When St. Amour and his colleagues presented themselves to take leave, the Pope complimented them warmly on the learning, eloquence, and ability they had shown in the discharge of their duty ; and repeated the assurance that the Bull was not to be understood as contravening or disparaging in any degree the doctrine of St. Augustine, which was and would always be that of the Holy See and of the Church.* But his Holiness was far

* Racine, *Hist. de Port Royal*, p. 72. *Journal de Saint Amour*, Pt. vi. chap. 28.

from intending to affirm (though the Jansenists thought proper to interpret his words to that effect) that every sentiment expressed by Augustine on the deep mysteries of grace was to be regarded as forming part of the infallible tradition of the Church Catholic.

Copies of the Bull were immediately despatched to France, accompanied by briefs to the Queen Regent, to the King, to Cardinal Mazarin, and to the bishops, exhorting them to cause it to be published and duly executed. A royal edict for that purpose was issued accordingly to the prelates of the kingdom on the 4th of July; and on the 11th, those who were in Paris assembled at the Louvre to the number of thirty, three of whom, the Bishops of Valence, Chalons and Grasse, were among the signers of the letter to the Pope in deprecation of the late proceedings. After a speech from Mazarin, the Bull was accepted, though not altogether without objection; and the bishops drew up a letter to the Pope, expressing the satisfaction and gratitude with which the Gallican Church welcomed the important step taken by his Holiness.* The questions lately agitated, they observed, were of the deepest moment; vital doctrines were at stake; that of the ineffable love which the Redeemer bears to the whole race of man; that of the work of salvation, effected as it is co-ordinately by the aid of Divine grace and by the free action of the human will, supernaturally aroused and sustained. These truths had been obscured by the rash lucubrations of Jansenius; but his Holiness had re-established them in all their former lustre by the decree which he had just pronounced at the desire of the bishops of France, in conformity with the ancient rule of faith derived from Scripture and the tradition of the Fathers. In like manner as Pope Innocent I. had condemned the heresy of Pelagius upon the report submitted to him by the bishops of Africa, so had Innocent X. denounced heresy in its opposite extreme on the application of the Gallican episcopate. And as the Church of the fifth century unanimously adhered to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff of that day, relying not only on the promises made by Christ to St. Peter, but on the acts of preceding Popes, such as those of

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 235. D'Avigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 268.

Damasus in condemnation of Apollinarius and Macedonius; so his Holiness might be assured that in the present instance, the same supreme authority having been exerted, it would be regarded by the whole Church with the same unqualified respect. Since in this cause the earthly monarch might be said (in the language of Sixtus III.) to be confederate with the King of heaven, there could be no question that the new heresy would be crushed against the immovable Rock, and would be finally destroyed.

The same prelates addressed a circular letter to their brethren, together with a form of mandement, which they recommended for adoption and publication in every diocese. The bishops in general accepted this recommendation; but some few judged it advisable to explain that the bull—in the terms of which they cordially concurred—was not designed to affect in any measure the doctrine of St. Augustine concerning efficacious grace. Foremost among those who took this course was Gondrin, Archbishop of Sens, a well-known partisan of the Jansenists; he was followed by Henry Arnould, Bishop of Angers (a brother of the great Antoine), and by the Bishops of Beauvais, Orleans, and Comminges.*

The Sorbonne, on the motion of the Bishop of Rennes, registered the Pope's constitution without opposition; and it was ordered that any member of the Faculty who might thenceforward maintain publicly either of the condemned Propositions should be expelled from the Society, and his name be erased from the list of doctors. Corresponding measures were adopted by the provincial Universities, and by most of the religious communities. The bull was likewise accepted without hesitation in Flanders, and even by the University of Louvain, the very cradle of Jansenist theology.

It must be borne in mind that the posture of political affairs at this moment was unfavourable to the Jansenists. The faction of the Fronde—with which, whether justly or unjustly, they had been identified from the beginning of the civil troubles—had recently made its submission to the Government. Mazarin had returned triumphantly from exile; his bitter enemy, De Retz,

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 277. Ellies-Dupin, *Hist. Eccles. du XVII. Siècle*, tom. ii. *Histoire de Port Royal*, Part ii. Liv. xi.

who was generally looked upon as the most powerful patron of Port Royal, had been outmanœuvred by the Court, and was a prisoner in the chateau of Vincennes. The minister, in this full tide of popularity, found no difficulty in carrying out a rigorous line of policy against the defenders of the ‘Augustinus,’ damaged and discredited as they were already in public opinion. The questions in dispute, in their purely theological character, were to Mazarin matters of supreme indifference; but it was his interest to conciliate the Pope, who had expressed strongly his displeasure at the imprisonment of De Retz, and the attempts made to extort from him a resignation of his see; while the preservation of his ascendancy at court was an object still nearer to his heart. He saw that both purposes might be served at once by gratifying the Jesuits; and accordingly the subtle Italian lent himself willingly to the designs of the party which for the time was in the stronger position. The heads of the French Church acquiesced with more or less alacrity; and whereas the bull “*In eminenti*” had been the subject of endless cavils, the bull “*Cùm occasione*” was approved almost unanimously throughout the kingdom.

The pastoral of the Archbishop of Sens was forwarded by the nuncio at Paris to Rome, where it excited grave animadversion; for the writer had enunciated in strong terms the obnoxious Gallican maxim, that the right of judging in the first instance in causes ecclesiastical belongs to the diocesan episcopate. The Pope threatened the Archbishop with excommunication; but contented himself afterwards with naming a commission of bishops to adjudicate in his stead. The Commissioners (or rather the Nuncio and Mazarin, who took the matter into their own hands) endeavoured to obtain satisfaction from the Archbishop in the shape of a letter disavowing the doctrines of his pastoral. This he declined; but consented, after much negotiation, to write to the Pope signifying in general terms his adhesion to the late constitution, avoiding, however, any precise definition of the *sense* which he attached to the condemnation of the Five Propositions.* This ultimatum in the way of concession was tacitly accepted, and no further proceedings were taken in the case.

* This arrangement was due to the good offices of Pierre de Marca, then Archbishop of Toulouse.

Notwithstanding the universal profession of readiness to bow to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, the excitement connected with Jansenius and his work was by no means destined to subside. At the point which we have now reached the controversy entered upon a new phase; and henceforward the course pursued by the Jansenists does little credit to their reputation for honesty and candour. The bull "*Cum occasione*" was manifestly intended to condemn certain opinions published and maintained by the late Bishop of Ypres. The '*Augustinus*' was the sole subject-matter of the controversy; the application to Rome had been made for the express purpose of obtaining a definite judgment on its contents; and the whole drift of the judicial investigation tended towards this end. The bull, however, did not declare that the condemned propositions were cited, *totidem verbis*, from the '*Augustinus*;' while on the other hand the Pope had privately stated that the censure by no means applied to the doctrine of efficacious grace,* nor to any other part of the teaching of St. Augustine. From these two facts, the Jansenists proceeded to extract a system of evasive self-justification. They admitted that the Five Propositions were justly condemned; but they contended that Jansenius had never held such opinions; that no such statements were to be found in his work; that his doctrine on the points in question was identical with that of St. Augustine, which was confessedly unimpeached and unimpeachable; and that in consequence the Pontifical sentence was no more a condemnation of the Bishop of Ypres than of the Bishop of Hippo. The sense in which the Propositions were declared heretical, they insisted, was not that of Jansenius, but one falsely imputed to him, altogether misrepresenting his sentiments. His real belief had been explained at length by those who lately advocated his cause at Rome. It was that of an orthodox

* Both Molinists and Jansenists alike professed to hold this doctrine, which rested too firmly on the authority of the primitive Church to be denied in terms by any Catholic divine. The point at issue between them was whether the efficacy of grace is exclusively inherent in its own essence, or whether it is efficacious only in conjunction with the will of those who are

its subjects. The Jansenists maintained the former to be the doctrine of St. Augustine and of all antiquity; the Molinists contended for the latter interpretation. The bull "*Cum occasione*" did not touch this controversy. All that it really decided was that the doctrine of Jansenius was not that of St. Augustine.

Catholic, equally far removed from the heresy of Calvin on the one side and from the Semi-Pelagianism of Molina on the other.

Such was the purport of three treatises from the pen of Antoine Arnauld* (printed, however, without his name), in reply to one entitled 'Cavilli Jansenianorum,' by Father Annat, the Jesuit confessor of Louis XIV. The bishops, who saw that if this sophistical line of defence were allowed to pass unchallenged the Pope's bull would become utterly illusory, forthwith held a meeting, and appointed a committee to examine whether the Five Propositions existed textually in the work of Jansenius. After careful investigation, they reported, on the 26th of March, 1654, that the Propositions were indubitably contained in the 'Augustinus;' that the Pope had condemned them as having been advanced by Jansenius, and in the sense intended by that author; that the said Propositions follow of necessity from the dogma that all grace which gives the power to act rightly is invariably efficacious; and that this being notoriously the doctrine of Jansenius, the condemned heresies must, by the very force of the terms, be referred to him. The report pointed out, further, that the Jansenists were without warrant in asserting that their doctrine was identical with that of St. Augustine; that Augustine, rightly understood, was in accordance with the late Papal constitution, and opposed to the opinions of Jansenius. Augustine, undoubtedly, had taught, with regard to the subjects in dispute, what appertained to the Rule of Faith; but he had taught, in addition, other things which were not of faith, and which had been left undecided by Pope Celestine. Now, it was the misfortune of Jansenius that the opinions contained in the Five Propositions were not among those which the Church had classed as open questions, but among those which were contrary to the primitive Rule of Faith—that faith which Augustine had so triumphantly defended. No Catholic writer of an earlier date than Baius had ever interpreted Augustine in the sense advocated by Jansenius; and Baius, as all the world knew, had been condemned for that very reason by Popes Gregory XIII. and Pius V. In conclu-

* 1. 'Réponse au Père Annat touchant les V. Propositions.' 2. 'Mémoire sur le dessein des Jesuites de faire retomber la censure des V. Pro-

positions sur la véritable doctrine de S. Augustin.' 3. 'Eclaircissement de quelques nouvelles objections sur le Fait de Jansenius.'

sion, the Report referred to the Council of Trent, whose decrees had fixed definitively the true meaning of that great and saintly Doctor of the Church, whom commentators so grossly misrepresented.*

This report was opposed at first by the Archbishop of Sens and other prelates; but eventually they agreed to it, with certain reservations, out of consideration for their brethren and for the sake of peace. It was forwarded to Rome, and was received by the Pope with lively expressions of gratitude. His Holiness replied in a brief addressed to the General Assembly of the French clergy, in which he stated that he had condemned by his bull "the doctrine of Cornelius Jansenius, as contained in his work entitled 'Augustinus.'" By the same brief he exhorted the clergy to execute a decree which he had recently issued, proscribing no less than forty different publications in defence of Jansenius. The list included Antoine Arnauld's two 'Apologies' for that prelate; the famous 'Ecrit à trois colonnes;' a treatise, 'De la Grace victorieuse,' by the Abbé de la Lanne; the pastoral letters of the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Comminges; and the 'Catéchisme de la Grace,' attributed to a doctor of the Sorbonne named Feydeau.

These were among the last acts of the pontificate of Innocent X. He expired on the 7th of January, 1655, and was succeeded by Cardinal Chigi, who assumed the name of Alexander VII.

Mazarin, without waiting for the regular session of the General Assembly, called the bishops together at the Louvre in May, 1655, and persuaded them not only to receive the late brief of Pope Innocent, but also to send a circular letter to their colleagues, urging them to cause the bull "Cùm occasione," together with the brief of September, 1654, to be *subscribed* by the clergy of all ranks throughout the kingdom, including the rectors of Universities and all persons holding public office in the Church, under pain of being proceeded against as heretics.† Such was the first mention of this ill-advised measure, the ulterior results of which were so fraught with disaster to the Church of France.

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 202, et seqq. *Procès-Verbaux des Assemblées Générales du Cl. de* | *F.*, tom. iv. 'Pièces justificatives,' No. v.
 † *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 265.

It might have been reasonably hoped that, since Rome had now spoken in a tone of authority which none could mistake or dispute, both parties in the strife would be content to lay down their arms and proclaim peace; that the victors would have deemed it wise to triumph with moderation; and that the vanquished, on their part, would have exhibited a spirit of frank and cordial submission. Events, however, turned out very differently. The Jansenists, while professing to abjure *ex animo* the five heretical Propositions, persisted in their theory that, notwithstanding the recent proceedings, the doctrine of Jansenius was not in reality condemned. The dominant majority, on the other hand, abused their success; they pressed the Papal judgment to unwarrantable lengths, and converted it into an instrument of persecution. The stigma of heresy was now inflicted without mercy upon all who were known to sympathise in any measure with Jansenius; and the scourge was applied with special rigour to Port Royal, upon which ill-fated community the Jesuits resolved to wreak their malice to the uttermost.

Port Royal was at this time in the meridian of its fame and prosperity. The Abbess Angélique had returned, in May, 1648, to the original cloister in the valley of Chevreuse, where the community over which she presided seldom numbered less than a hundred, including novices and postulants. Singlin still filled the office of Director, assisted by Isaac de Sacy, one of the nephews of Antoine Arnauld. Pierre Nicole, Claude Lancelot, Sebastian Tillemont, were prosecuting their learned labours at Les Granges, a farmhouse which overlooked the monastery. The Duc de Luynes, son of the Constable, was installed in a modest mansion, the Château de Vaumurier, in close proximity to the abbey, where he led a life of pious and studious seclusion. It was at this period, too, that the Port Royalists received an illustrious addition to their ranks in the person of Blaise Pascal,—a name not more inseparably linked with the history of philosophical and scientific discovery than with the Jansenistic controversy. His sister Jacqueline had made her profession at the convent some two years previously, under the name of Sœur Ste. Euphémie. Her influence, added to the fervent exhortations of Singlin and De Sacy, and the impression produced by a remarkable escape from imminent danger to his life, determined Pascal to dedicate the remainder

of his days to God; and he joined the Jansenist fraternity towards the close of 1654.* Two of his intimate friends followed him soon afterwards—the Duc de Roannez and M. Domat, a celebrated advocate of Clermont.

Antoine Arnauld, since the promulgation of the Bull “*Cum occasione*,” or at all events since it had been confirmed by Alexander VII., had taken refuge in prudential silence. He sometimes visited Port Royal, but declined as far as possible all public duty, and occupied himself in preparing a treatise in refutation of the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist. But this interval of comparative tranquillity was to be abruptly terminated. The Jesuits, flushed with victory, could not resist the opportunity of dealing a fatal blow to the prestige and power of their rivals, reckless of the consequences which such a course might entail upon the national Church at large. At this moment, indeed, it would have required an uncommon share of dispassionate judgment and far-sighted wisdom to perceive that the cause of religion would be better served by conciliating the Port Royalists than by driving them to desperation. It was on occasion on which, if ever, it was excusable to identify the triumph of a party with the triumph of Catholic truth.

The following are the circumstances which led to the outburst of the storm.

Among the many aristocratic patrons of the Jansenists one of the staunchest was the Duc de Liancour,—a nobleman who, after wasting his earlier years in fashionable dissipation, had been won to a life of piety by the counsels and example of his wife, a daughter of the Duke of Schomberg. The Duke, when at Paris, resided in the parish of S. Sulpice,—at that time under the pastoral charge of the celebrated Abbé Olier. In January, 1655, the Duke was informed by M. Picoté, one of the clergy of S. Sulpice to whom he resorted for confession, that he could not give him absolution unless he promised to break off all intercourse with “*Messieurs de Port Royal*”—a connection incompatible with due deference to the late decisions of the Church. In particular, the confessor required that the Duke’s granddaughter, who was receiving her education at Port Royal,

* Bonav. Racine, *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, tom. xii. p. 127.

should be removed; and that two leading Jansenists, Des Mares and Bourgeois, who were sojourning under the duke's roof, should no longer be entertained there. M. de Liancour, staggered and offended, declined compliance, and left the confessional without absolution.* He forthwith complained to his friends—Vincent de Paul among others—of the strange treatment he had met with; and the affair became speedily and widely public. It was an act of direct challenge to Port Royal, and was not likely to pass unanswered. Antoine Arnauld, with characteristic alacrity, stepped forth once more into the lists, prepared to do battle *à outrance* against all comers. On the 24th of February, 1655, appeared (anonymously) his 'Lettre à une personne de condition;'[†] in which he maintains, on the authority of St. Augustine and St. Leo, that a priest is not justified in withholding the Sacraments from any but persons actually convicted and excommunicated as heretics; and that MM. de Port Royal were by no means in that predicament. Their doctrine, he contended, was that of St. Augustine, which had been declared by successive Popes and Councils to be that of the Church. And even supposing they had fallen into error, this was a matter belonging to the cognizance of the Diocesan, and not of the parochial clergy. Arnauld moreover asserted, in the name of his whole party, that they were ready to abjure the five heretical Propositions wherever they might be found, including the writings of Jansenius, though they were unable to perceive them there.[‡] They were not committed, he said,

* Gerberon, *Hist. Gén. du Jansenisme*, tom. ii. p. 256.

† *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xix. p. 311.

‡ This line of apology was palpably inconsistent with their earlier sentiments upon the question. Arnauld himself had maintained in his pamphlet against the *Entreprise de M. Cornet*, that the Propositions were not deserving of censure, and that they could not be condemned without introducing new articles of faith unknown to the tradition of the Church. How could he have argued thus, had he not at that time believed the Propositions to be orthodox, and (what is more) to have been really held in substance by Jansenius? Such a man as

Arnauld is not for a moment to be charged with conscious disingenuousness; but he was certainly a master of the difficult art of "changing front in face of an enemy." For the sake of some readers it may be well to quote here the deliberate opinion of the great Bossuet as to the "fact of Jansenius." "If your confessor," he writes to the Maréchal de Bellefonds, "who forbids you to speak of the Five Propositions without adding that they were held by Jansenius, means merely to prevent you from asserting that they are *not* his, he is right. You ought not to make such an assertion; inasmuch as even those who defend Jansenius acknowledge that, out of respect for the ecclesiastical judgment which has de-

to any private speculations broached by modern theologians; but relied solely upon the authority and universally-accepted teaching of St. Augustine.

The Molinists, well pleased to have provoked Arnauld to resume his polemical attitude, launched a profusion of pamphlets in reply, urging that mere professions of acquiescence were not sufficient under the circumstances; that divines who at one time had notoriously defended Jansenius were bound, after the decision of the Vatican, to disavow their error in express terms, and renounce the views of that author as contained, and pronounced by the Church to be contained, in the Five Propositions. Especially was this indispensable since the Assembly of the clergy of France had affirmed so positively that the Propositions were condemned as being extracted from the 'Augustinus' of Jansenius, and in the sense intended by that prelate. If the friends of Port Royal hesitated to accept, in identical terms, these declarations of the Holy Father and of the Gallican clergy, they must not complain of any suspicions which might arise with regard to the sincerity of their present professions.

These taunts drew from Arnauld his 'Second Letter to a Duke and Peer of France' (the Duc de Luynes), which bore his name, and was dated from Port Royal des Champs, July 10, 1655. It was a volume in size, and contains a complete digest of the discipline of the Church as to the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist; followed, in the second part, by a bold defence of the position maintained by the Jansenists in relation to the Bull "*Cum occasione*," the declaration of the Gallican clergy, the doctrine of Jansenius, and the five condemned Propositions. Arnauld transmitted this treatise to Pope Alexander VII., with a letter expressing unqualified submission to the judgment of his Holiness.

It was from this 'Second Letter to a Duke and Peer'* that

cided that they *are* his, they are bound to preserve silence on that point. . . . For the rest, I am very happy to tell you, in a few words, my sentiments on the main question. I am of opinion, then, that the Propositions are really and truly in Jansenius, and that they are the soul (*l'âme*) of his book. All that has been said to the contrary appears to me mere sophistry (*une*

pure chicane) and a device for eluding the judgment of the Church. To say that one ought not to have, and cannot have, a pious belief in her decisions on matters of fact, is to advance a proposition of dangerous consequence, and contrary both to tradition and practice." *Correspondance de Bossuet, Lettres diverses*. Lett. lii.

* *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xix. p. 335.

the enemies of Arnauld extracted two distinct charges, which they pressed against himself and the cause which he represented, with terrible and ruinous effect. They accused him, in the first place, of denying that the Five Propositions were contained in the 'Augustinus' of Jansenius—thereby contravening the express decisions of the Holy See; and secondly, of re-asserting, in other words, the first of the Propositions in the following statement:—"The Fathers point out to us, in the person of St. Peter, a just man to whom that grace was wanting without which we can do nothing, on an occasion when it cannot be denied that he fell into sin." These impeachments—the former of which became known as the "question de fait" or of fact, and the latter as that of "droit" or doctrine—were formally laid before the Sorbonne on the 4th of November, 1655.

The conflict of parties now became of absorbing interest, and stirred the religious mind of France to its inmost depths. With the Jansenists it was henceforth a struggle for life or death; for the manifest object of this new attack was to destroy for ever the character of their leader, and to leave them no tenable standing-point within the pale of the Church.*

On the motion being made for a Committee to examine Arnauld's treatise, his friends urged that, since he had appealed to the Pope for his judgment on the work, the Sorbonne could not with propriety take any steps which might anticipate that sentence. This, however, was overruled, and it was resolved by a majority of voices to proceed with the examination. A Committee of six doctors was thereupon appointed, all of whom are said to have been well known as hostile to the Jansenists.†

The ancient usages of the Theological Faculty seem to have been violated without scruple on this occasion. One statute provided that the Mendicant Friars should never enjoy more than eight votes at the deliberative meetings—two for each Order. Thirty and even forty monks were nevertheless allowed to congregate in this Assembly—a number sufficient to turn the

* The following extract shows how the Jesuit tactics were regarded at the time by a sharp-witted man of the world. "On continue en Sorbonne de tourmenter le pauvre M. A. Arnauld, qui vaut mieux que tous les Molinistes ensemble — les uns pour avoir les

bonnes grâces de la Reine, et les autres pour attraper des bénéfices et avoir du credit à Rome. Auri sacra fames, etc." *Gui Patin*, Lettre cclxiv. January 11, 1655.

† Gerberon, *Hist. du Jansenisme*, tom. ii. p. 259.

scale in whatever direction they pleased. Against this proceeding sixty doctors, with Louis de St. Amour at their head, complained, "*comme d'abus*," to the Parliament; but the Court and Mazarin interposed, and the magistrates, availing themselves of a technical difficulty, postponed their decision upon the appeal until long after the debates at the Sorbonne had concluded.* The report of the Committee pronounced Arnauld censurable upon both counts of the indictment: upon the *first* question, that of fact—they declared his sentiments "rash, disrespectful to the Holy See, and injurious to the clergy of France." His doctrine on the *second* point, relating to the fall of St. Peter, they stigmatized as heretical, and already condemned as such by the Church.

A tumultuous contest arose when this report was presented to the Faculty. Such was the prevailing disorder, that Hardouin de Péréfixe, then Bishop of Rodez, procured a *lettre de cachet* for restraining the combatants within more decorous bounds; and the king ordered Seguier, the Chancellor, to take his seat in the assembly for the purpose of enforcing obedience to this mandate.

Arnauld declined to defend himself in person, since the permission to do so was clogged with conditions which he deemed unjust and disadvantageous. He confined himself therefore to written statements; repeating, with every variety of expression, the same tone of self-vindication—that he had carefully studied the 'Augustinus,' without being able to discover in it the Five Propositions censured by the Pope; that, nevertheless, he cordially acquiesced in their condemnation, and was ready to declare them heretical in whatever work they might appear without exception; including, therefore, the writings of Jansenius. He protested that in making the statement complained of he had not intended anything offensive to his Holiness or the French prelates; he humbly craved their pardon for the unintentional affront; and he submitted that at all events such a statement of opinion could not be brought within the category of heresy.

With regard to the point of doctrine, Arnauld made considerable concessions; in a letter to the Bishop of St. Brioux he admitted the distinction drawn by the Thomists between the

* *Gui Patin*, Lettre cclxxxiii. tom. ii. p. 229.

different kinds and degrees of grace, acknowledging that by the former the just man possesses habitually, and as it were abstractedly, the power to keep God's commandments, while the latter, efficacious grace, which alone moves and determines the will, is not vouchsafed to all; notwithstanding which, St. Thomas teaches that without such grace no man, although regenerate and justified, can actually perform that which is good.

After eighteen sittings the Faculty came to a vote on the question of *fact* on the 14th of January, 1656. One hundred and twenty-four doctors, among whom were forty monks, gave their voices for the censure as proposed in the report; seventy-one took the opposite side; eleven remained neutral.

The Assembly next proceeded to discuss the question of *doctrine*. It had been arranged, in order to avoid needless prolixity, that no speaker should occupy the attention of the house for more than half an hour. The partisans of Arnauld found it difficult to conform to this regulation; and the Chancellor was obliged to take peremptory measures to set bounds to the torrent of their eloquence. Upon his no less than sixty doctors, after signing a protest against the infraction of their liberties, left the hall in a body, and never appeared afterwards at the meetings of the Faculty. Among the seceders was Jean de Launoi, one of the most distinguished of the doctors for talent, erudition, and zeal for the Gallican liberties. De Launoi did not sympathize altogether with the school of Port Royal; but the harshness and unfairness of the proceedings against Arnauld shocked his natural uprightness of mind, and he generously declared himself in favour of the injured party. His publications on this occasion are specially valuable, not only from their vigour and force of reasoning, but from the complete independence of the author's testimony.*

The final vote was taken on the 29th of January, when the "question de droit" was decided against Arnauld by an immense majority—nearly all his friends absenting themselves purposely from the division. His doctrine was pronounced "rash, impious, blasphemous, and already branded as heretical;"

* B. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xi. Pt. ii. p. 356. See "Joann. Launoi Notationes in censuram duarum Anton.

Arnaldi Propositionum," in Arnauld's Works, tom. xx. p. 348.

and it was ordered in consequence, that unless he should make retractation within fifteen days by subscribing the censure, he should be degraded from the rank of doctor of the Sorbonne and expelled from the Society. Nor was this all. The sentence against Arnauld was made a test of orthodoxy for the future. All persons proceeding to the degree of bachelor and doctor were required to sign the censure previously; and any member of the Faculty who should preach, teach, maintain, or approve the condemned opinions, was declared liable to the same penalty of expulsion.

Arnauld, declining to give the required satisfaction, was accordingly deprived of his degrees; and the sixty doctors who had so steadfastly supported him throughout the contest suffered a like punishment.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE field was lost for the Port Royalists; but their leaders thought it possible that, by means of a skilful diversion, a considerable portion of the ground from which they had been driven might be recovered. It was resolved to attempt this by assailing with the shafts of satire—weapons at all times of peculiar potency in France—the most vulnerable points of the enemy's position. Such was the object of the '*Lettres écrites à un provincial par un de ses amis*,' commonly called the '*Provincial Letters*;' the first of which appeared on the 23rd of January, 1656, while the question of Arnauld's condemnation was still under discussion at the Sorbonne. They were written by Pascal, at the instigation, and partly with the assistance, of Arnauld himself. At first they were published without any name; afterwards the author assumed that of Louis de Montalte. The "provincial" to whom they were addressed was M. Périer, Pascal's brother-in-law, a magistrate of the Cour des aides at Clermont.

In the first and second of these letters, Pascal ridicules the technical phrases "*pouvoir prochain*" and "*grace suffisante*;" which, so far as mere phraseology is concerned, were perhaps fair subjects for raillery. They expressed, however, important theological truths; truths involving the entire discrepancy between the views of Jansenius and the received teaching of the Church. That man, in his regenerate state, possesses in a certain true sense the power or capacity of keeping the Divine commandments, was almost universally acknowledged among orthodox Catholics; though, from the infirmity which still remains in our nature, that power is not always carried out in action. The grace which gives such power was known by various names;—"adjutorium sine quo non," "*gratia possibilitatis*," "*grace suffisante*," "*grace excitante*," "*potential grace*." It was thus distinguished from "*efficacious grace*," namely that by which the will is not only empowered, but moved and deter-

mined to the actual fulfilment of the law. This distinction was not admitted by the Jansenists; they held that all grace which is "sufficient" must be "efficacious" also;* from which it followed that such a measure of grace as does not absolutely determine the will is not sufficient for obedience; so that when a just man falls into sin, he has no power to avoid it.

The particular epithet in question was open to exception; and, in the hands of Pascal, the "grace suffisante qui ne suffit pas" became irresistibly grotesque. Yet the idea is not really paradoxical, though it has that appearance. An army may be *sufficient*, in point of numbers, courage, and science, to reduce a given fortress; but it does not follow that it will actually capture it. A statesman may possess sufficient talent and experience to lead the House of Commons; but it does not follow that he will in fact succeed in leading it. In St. Augustine's words, "Non est consequens, ut qui *potest* venire, etiam veniat, nisi id voluerit atque fecerit."†

The third letter is an indignant protest against Arnauld's condemnation, which had at length been published. Pascal denounces the sentence as unjust, preposterous, and nugatory, inasmuch as it was passed under coercion, and in the absence of a large body of dissentients. "It was not Arnauld's opinions that were declared heretical, but his person; it was a personal heresy. He was a heretic, not on account of what he had written, but solely because he was M. Arnauld. St. Augustine's doctrine of grace would never be the true one, so long as it was defended by Arnauld. It would at once become true if he happened to oppose it. Indeed this would be the surest, perhaps the only, way to establish Augustinianism and to destroy Molinism."

These three earlier letters, together with the seventeenth and eighteenth, which conclude the series, are all that treat directly of the Jansenistic controversy. In the fourth, the argument is transferred from the region of dogmatic to that of moral theology; the object of attack being the system of casuistry practised by the Jesuits. This is criticised with exquisite wit and trenchant force. The principle upon which

* See Jansenius, *De Gratiâ Christi Salvatoris*, Lib. iii. cap. 1.

† S. Aug., *De Gratiâ Christi*, Lib. cap. 14.

the Society acted with regard to the use of the Sacraments seems to have guided them likewise in the department of Christian morals; namely that of softening the strictness of the Gospel rule, so as to accommodate it to the habits of ordinary men of the world. That rule, under their treatment, acquired an amount of elasticity which made it practically indulgent to human infirmity, not only in small matters, but to a dangerous extent.* Many of the most eminent writers on casuistical divinity in the latter half of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries were Jesuits; such as Lessius, Sanchez, Bauny, Emanuel Sa, Vasquez, Suarez, and Antonio Escobar. In proportion as the fame and influence of the Order increased, its confessors were perpetually brought into contact with religious doubts, scruples, perplexities, and emergencies of every description; and were thus almost compelled to provide themselves with a code of ethics embracing, so far as it was possible to embrace, all the numberless problems and minute distinctions of moral responsibility. Nevertheless, it must be recollected that the science of casuistry was not the invention of the Jesuits. In their hands, no doubt, it received an extreme and in many respects mischievous, development. But long before the days of Loyola this was accounted an essential branch of theological study; and, indeed, from the moment when the Church enforced auricular confession as a universal duty, it became indispensable to the clergy in the instruction and guidance of souls. It would be easy to produce a long list of Roman divines of all shades of opinion, who have devoted themselves to the examination of cases of conscience, and have published professed treatises on the subject; among such may be named, as altogether unconnected with

* Bossuet passes a somewhat severe censure on them in his *Oraison Funèbre de Nicolas Cornet*. "Il a pris à quelques docteurs une malheureuse et inhumaine complaisance, une pitié meurtrière, qui leur a fait porter des coussins sous les coudes des pécheurs, chercher des couvertures à leurs passions, pour condescendre à leur vanité, et flatter leur ignorance affectée. . . . Vous donc, docteurs relâchés, puisque l'Evangile est un joug, ne le rendez pas si facile; de peur que si vous êtes

chargés de son poids, vos passions indomptées ne le secouent trop facilement; et qu'ayant rejeté le joug, nous ne marchions indociles, superbes, indisciplinés, au gré de nos desirs impétueux." He deals out an equal measure, however, to divines of the opposite school,—“qui ont tenu les consciences captives sous des rigueurs très-injustes; qui ne peuvent supporter aucune faiblesse; qui traînent toujours l'enfer après eux, et ne fulminent que des anathèmes.”

the Jesuits, Bartolomeo Medina, Dominic Soto, John Nieder, and Diego Alvarez, all of the Order of Dominicans, and Miguel Salon, an Augustinian.

The theory of "probabilism" is impeached by Pascal in the fifth letter, as the main source and basis of the corrupt morality propagated by the Jesuits. According to this system, it is lawful to follow the *less* probable opinion, though it be the less sure, provided it has been held by any one doctor of high repute for learning and piety.* And further, a doctor is justified in giving advice which is contrary to his own conviction, if such advice has been sanctioned by other doctors, whenever it appears more favourable and acceptable to the person applying for direction. Nay, he may tender an opinion which is held probable by some eminent divine, even when he himself is persuaded that it is absolutely false.† In like manner, a confessor ought to absolve a penitent who follows a probable opinion, although personally he may entertain the contrary sentiment. To refuse absolution in such a case would be mortal sin. Pascal goes on to show, in a series of instances, how, with the help of this ingenious hypothesis, the plainest precepts of the Divine law may be evaded, and excuses may be found for delinquencies of all kinds. Simony, sacrilege, usury, dishonesty, robbery, and even homicide in certain cases, are justified on this slippery principle.

In the seventh letter the casuists are attacked with reference to their method of "directing the intention;"—a species of mental chicanery which undermined the very foundations of social faith and duty. "If one can direct the mental *intention* to a permitted object, one may *act* in whatever way is most convenient or pleasant. Thus men are enabled at once to satisfy the requirements of the Gospel, and to comply with the received usages of worldly life. They please the world by their conduct, and at the same time they conform to the

* This doctrine is attributed to Sanchez and to Emanuel Sa.

† This is cited by Pascal as if from the *Theologia Moralis* of the Jesuit Paul Laymann; but it seems to be scarcely a fair version of his teaching. His words are "Imo arbitror nihil à ratione alienum fore, si doctor consultus

significet consulenti, opinionem à quibusdam viris doctis tanquam probabilem defendi, quam proinde sequi ipsi liceat; quamvis idem doctor ejusmodi sententiam speculative falsam esse certò sibi persuadeat, ut proinde ipsemet in praxi eam sequi non possit."

primary rule of the Gospel by *purifying their inward intentions.*" This is, in other words, that most pernicious maxim, that "the end justifies the means;" which has become, though somewhat unfairly, proverbially identified with Jesuitry. The same sophism is used by the casuists to defend prevarication, lying, perjury, and unfaithfulness to engagements of all kinds; for "no promise is binding when one has not the inward intention of becoming bound by it."

Pascal describes, in the ninth and following letters, other expedients invented by the casuists for making the way of salvation smooth and easy, especially as regards the duties of devotion. He quotes from a manual called '*Le Paradis ouvert*,' by Father Bauny, rules which make devotional religion to consist chiefly in paying homage to images of the Virgin, saying the "*Petit chapelet des dix plaisirs de la Vierge*," pronouncing frequently the name of Mary, *desiring* to build more churches in her honour than have ever been built by all the monarchs in the world, saying to her "*bon jour*" and "*bon soir*" every morning and evening, and repeating every day the "*Ave Maria*" in honour of the "*heart of Mary*." Directions are cited which tend to reconcile with the law of Christ all the vices to which our depraved nature is most prone—vanity, envy, sloth, luxury, unchastity; and various artifices are exposed by which the discipline of the confessional may be rendered wholly nugatory in the case of persons living in habitual sin.

The sixteenth letter is devoted to a refutation of the calumnies of the Jesuits Meynier and Brisacier against the community of Port Royal, whom they charged with denying the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and other Calvinistic heresies. Pascal also undertakes to vindicate the Abbé de S. Cyran and Antoine Arnauld from the imputation of being in league with Geneva and the Huguenots for the destruction of the Catholic faith; noticing especially an absurd fable called the "*Conspiracy of Bourg-Fontaine*," at which place it was alleged that the Jansenist leaders, mysteriously congregated in a dark wood, had pledged themselves to a revolutionary enterprise which was to subvert not only the Roman Church, but Christianity itself. This is on the face of it so wildly improbable, that it is

needless to enter on an examination of the arguments on either side.*

The two concluding numbers—published at the distance of a full year from the commencement of the work, and addressed to Father Annat—revert to the original subject-matter of the Jansenist controversy. Pascal now lays aside his sarcastic style, and embarks on a lengthened argumentation with the view of rebutting the charge of heresy from himself and his associates, and showing that the Papal censures were directed against a mere chimera, or, at all events, against tenets which had never been held by the Jansenists. These seventeenth and eighteenth Letters bear marks of anxious thought and patient labour; the latter is said to have been rewritten no less than thirteen times. They contain many passages of majestic eloquence, entitling their author to take eminent rank among the masters of rhetoric. Nor are they to be despised as specimens of learning; for Pascal produces a long list of references to Councils, historical precedents, and the works of standard theologians, to prove that the Pope and the Church are not infallible in judging of matters of fact, but solely in dogmatic definitions *de fide*. The meaning of a particular author, he contends, is simply a question of *fact*. Upon such a point the Pope may be mistaken; and consequently it cannot be heresy, though it may be presumption, to differ from the opinion propounded by his Holiness. The Church is protected by Divine authority in the exposition of the whole body of revealed doctrine—the “faith once delivered to the saints;” but with regard to other matters, not affecting revelation, mankind are left to the guidance of natural intellect and reason. If upon *such* subjects the Church should define and exact any belief as exclusively true, she would be exceeding her lawful powers, and imposing upon the faithful a yoke which God has never sanctioned. The Jansenists, then, were no heretics for merely questioning whether Jansenius did or did not entertain a given opinion. This is not a point of theology, but of historical fact; and therefore the “sense of Jansenius,” now so violently debated, is in reality a matter of indifference, upon

* The Abbé Maynard, however, in his edition of the *Provinciales*, seems more than half-inclined to endorse this preposterous fiction. Tom. ii. p. 215.

which men are fully at liberty to take opposite views, as they may in estimating the published works of any other author.

Pascal inveighs fiercely against the attempt of Father Annat to identify the "sense of Jansenius" with the theory of the heresiarch Calvin; quoting various passages from the 'Augustinus' to the effect that grace may always be resisted, and that the human will has at all times the power to consent to the suggestions of the Divine Spirit.* He also insists that the Jansenistic doctrine as to the efficacy of grace is one and the same with that of St. Thomas Aquinas; forgetting, apparently, that the Thomists distinctly inculcated the "gratia sufficiens," whereas in one of the earlier 'Provinciales' that term had been satirized without mercy and scornfully rejected.

The work concludes with a fervid peroration, charging all the scandal of the existing dissensions on the Jesuits, and imploring them, if not from charity towards their opponents, at least out of compassion for the sufferings of the Church their mother, to exchange their persecuting policy for one of conciliation and peace.

Such is a brief outline of this celebrated work; which has done more to perpetuate the fame of Pascal than any of his scientific or philosophical productions, though these last are of far weightier calibre.

The immediate success of the Letters was almost unexampled. A dry ecclesiastical controversy, hitherto confined to the cloister, the schools, and the Sorbonne, suddenly converted into a theme for plaisanterie and badinage, was a spectacle inexpressibly diverting to the Parisian mind. Thousand in different classes of society, who up to this time had viewed these intricate speculations with apathy or contempt, found themselves irresistibly attracted towards them now that they were recommended by all the graces of a faultless style, and accommodated to the level of an ordinary intellect. Public indignation was at once and vehemently excited against the Jesuit moralists; and as a natural consequence, a temporary reaction ensued in favour of the persecuted Jansenists. Hars

* This, however, was understood by Jansenius and his followers in an abstract sense; they acknowledged that the will is *able*, abstractedly, to resist

the agency of Divine grace; but they denied that grace is ever in point of fact resisted. See Jansen, *De Græ Christi*, Lib. ii. capp. 24, 25, 27.

proceedings had been commenced against them by the Government just before the appearance of the 'Provinciales;' the nuns of Port Royal were forbidden to add to the number of their novices and boarders; the Solitaries had been expelled from their retreat, and their schools abruptly closed. Further severities were averted by the vigorous castigation administered to their enemies by Pascal; and a remarkable incident of a different kind, which occurred at this critical moment, contributed not a little to re-establish for a season the declining fortunes of the Port Royalists. This was the miracle of the "Sainte Épine."

Among the "pensionnaires," or boarders, at Port Royal de Paris, was Marguerite Périer, a girl about eleven years of age, daughter of M. Périer the magistrate at Clermont, and niece of Blaise and Jacqueline Pascal. She had been afflicted for upwards of three years with fistula lacrymalis in the left eye. The disease was of a virulent character, and had made fearful ravages; the bones of the nose and palate had become carious; and the discharge of matter from the wound was so constant and offensive as to make it necessary to seclude the patient in great measure from the other inmates of the house. All medical treatment had proved unavailing. The child grew worse, and it was arranged, as a last resource, to apply the cautery, though the surgeon gave but slender hope of a successful result. Meanwhile the sisterhood received from an ecclesiastic named La Poterie a precious reliquary containing a portion of the Crown of Thorns which pierced the head of the Redeemer.* It was carried in procession to the altar of the convent chapel on the 24th of March, 1656, being the Friday of the third week in Lent. The nuns, each in her turn, kissed the sacred relic; and, when the pensionnaires approached for the same purpose, their governess, Sister Flavia, desired Mademoiselle Périer to commend herself to God, and apply

* The Crown of Thorns was purchased by Louis IX. of France from Baldwin II., Emperor of Constantinople. The Sainte Chapelle was built for its reception, and it was deposited there by the pious monarch, with every mark of profound veneration, on the 21st of April, 1248. It is still pre-

served in the Treasury of Notre Dame, and is exposed for devotion, together with other "instruments of the Passion," on Good Friday every year. The two thorns in the possession of M. de la Poterie were given to him by Queen Mary de Medicis.

the reliquary to the diseased eye.* She did so, and became conscious of a complete and instantaneous cure.

Whether on account of the strict discipline observed during the season of Lent, or from some other unexplained cause, the occurrence was not mentioned in the convent till the next day, nor was it generally known till a week afterwards. On the 31st of March, the surgeon, M. Dalencé, called to see his patient. Such was the alteration in her appearance, that, when she entered the room, he did not recognize her; and it was not till after minute examination, and on the most positive evidence of her identity, that he was at length convinced that a cure had taken place, which he did not hesitate to declare supernatural. The news now circulated like lightning through the city. The queen despatched her own surgeon to Port Royal to verify the facts; and a statement was drawn up by him, in concert with the other medical witnesses, attesting the reality of the cure, and pronouncing such a phenomenon to be beyond and above the operation of mere natural causes. Their testimony was confirmed by the ecclesiastical authorities; the Grand Vicars of the diocese, in the absence of the exiled Archbishop, published a formal recognition of the truth of the miracle. Solemn thanksgivings for this signal mercy were offered in the church of Port Royal; the Holy Thorn was presented to the convent in perpetuity; it was exposed every Friday for the veneration of the faithful; and a long list of additional instances followed, in which its healing virtues were exerted for the relief of the afflicted.

In every point of view the miracle of the "Sainte Épine" happened opportunely for the interests of Jansenism. How could Port Royal be a nest of heretics when Heaven itself interfered to work marvels in its favour? Was not the arm of the Most High visibly stretched forth to protect this much maligned community, and to vindicate its orthodoxy in upholding the efficacy of His sovereign grace? The cause of Port

* I have followed the narrative of Racine and Du Fossé. According to Jacqueline Pascal's account it was Sister Flavia herself who touched the eye of her pupil with the reliquary. "Ellemême prit la sainte relique et l'y appliqua, sans réflexion néanmoins."

She adds that the cure was discovered by Sister Flavia *the same evening*, and that she reported the fact to the Abbess; this done, they waited to see whether the restoration of the eye would prove permanent and perfect. V. Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal*.

Royal was demonstrated to be the cause of God; within those walls was the chosen home and sanctuary of the Truth. Thus reasoned, not only the superstitious multitude, but even the intelligent and educated classes; and the impression produced upon the public mind was such that the Government could not venture to disregard it. The decrees which had gone forth against Port Royal were hastily revoked; as early as the month of May Arnould d'Andilly received permission to return to his beloved retreat in the valley of Chevreuse; thither he was soon followed by Antoine Arnould, Nicole, and Antoine Le Maître; the other members of the fraternity reappeared by degrees, and the schools were ere long again in full operation. Viewed in combination with the extraordinary result of the Provincial Letters, this was an epoch of legitimate triumph for the Jansenists. Their popularity was greatly enhanced, the number of their disciples multiplied; and, although their opponents by no means slackened in activity, the minority on the whole maintained their ground with success. An interval of some years ensued, during which they were not molested by any further measures of forcible repression.

Two centuries have not sufficed to settle the questions arising from this singular episode of ecclesiastical history; those questions being, in the first place, whether the cure of Marguerite Périer was real; and if real, whether, secondly, it was supernatural. The truth is that questions of this nature can seldom be positively determined. Except by minds of a peculiar bias, "ecclesiastical miracles" (as they are called to distinguish them from those recorded in Holy Scripture) will always be regarded with insurmountable prejudice. Persons, not otherwise sceptically inclined, will reject with a smile of contempt the notion of supernatural agency as manifested in the Church of any age subsequent to that of the Apostles. The whole stream of Christian history, they urge, abounds with instances both of visionary delusion and of fraudulent fabrication for unworthy ends; and, under such circumstances, the weight of presumption against the genuineness of any particular miracle is all but overpowering.

Yet surely it cannot be logically maintained that, because the miracles of our Lord and His Apostles are distinct in character from those ascribed to the uninspired ages, therefore

these latter were not in *any* sense manifestations of a power beyond and above nature. Nor, again, because we find in history many cases of spurious miracles, or "pious frauds," will it follow that *all* modern occurrences involving miraculous pretensions are to be consigned to the same category. Nothing can be more unphilosophical than to found our opinions on such matters on mere *à priori* assumption or arbitrary prejudice. The true is to be discriminated from the false (in points not ruled by Infallible Authority) by patiently weighing the force and value of conflicting evidence, by scrutinizing motives and interests, by applying the tests of sound and enlightened criticism.

The prodigy of the "Sainte Épine" is supported by evidence which, if adduced to prove any ordinary fact, would probably be held conclusive. The various theories suggested for explaining it on merely natural grounds are scarcely less difficult to accept (some of them are more so) than the account of the Port Royalists themselves. Is it conceivable, for instance, that a sister of Mademoiselle Perier, who was also residing in the convent, was substituted for the real sufferer, and that the medical certificates attesting the cure were thus obtained by means of a gross deception? Or again, is it easy to believe, with M. Sainte Beuve,* that the application of the reliquary was made with so much force as to burst the morbid tumour, which thereupon dispersed so rapidly as to leave within the space of a few days no trace whatever of disease?

Admitting, however, that the facts of the case are well authenticated, it by no means follows that the Jansenists were justified in the inferences which they drew from them. They argued that such an event not only marked out Port Royal as a spot singularly privileged by Heaven, but also that it established incontestably the truth of the peculiar doctrines which Port Royal represented. It proved, beyond all further dispute, that Jansenius was orthodox; that Arnould was innocent; that St. Cyran was a persecuted saint; that Innocent X. was a misguided tyrant; that the Sorbonne was a conclave of benighted dotards. Such a conclusion was simply preposterous. The miraculous cure (if such it was) testified to the infinite bene-

* Ste. Beuve, *Port Royal*, tom. iii. p. 111.

volence of that Being, whose "tender mercies are over all His works;" but it were mere fanaticism to interpret it as a decision from above, on one side or the other, of a vexed question in polemical theology.

Father Annat, in a vigorous pamphlet, entitled '*Rabat-joie des Jansenistes*,' contested the genuineness of the miracle, denied the consequences deduced from it by the Port Royalists, and even maintained that, so far from proving anything in their favour, it was rather to be looked upon as a fresh call to repent of their heretical aberrations. To this an anonymous reply was published, which is attributed to Pascal, and inserted among his works; but there is reason to believe that he was largely assisted by the Abbé de Pontchâteau, one of his brother solitaries, and perhaps by others.

Marguerite Périer (the *miraculée*, as she was called by her friends) survived to the age of eighty-seven, and died at Clermont in the year 1733, preserving to the last an immovable conviction of the reality of the restoration wrought by the Sainte Épine.

The storm of clamour against the casuists—excited by the '*Provinciales*'—was not easily appeased. The parish priests of Rouen, at a meeting held on the 28th of August, 1656, denounced the moral teaching of the Jesuits to their Archbishop, De Harlai. That prelate referred their complaint to the convocation of clergy then sitting at Paris; and upon this the curés of the capital came forward in support of their brethren, and drew up a list of forty propositions, extracted from the works of the principal casuists, which they submitted to the judgment of the Assembly. A committee of bishops was appointed to report on it; but the synod was on the point of separating, and there was no time to enter on a discussion of such serious importance. The house contented itself with ordering an edition of St. Charles Borromeo's '*Instructions to Confessors*' to be printed at its expense, and circulated in every diocese, "to serve as a barrier for arresting the spread of novel opinions tending to the destruction of Christian morals." This must have been mortifying to the Jesuits, since it was well known that Arnauld's book, '*De la fréquente Communion*,' was derived principally from this very treatise of St. Charles, which was thus recommended as a text-book for the clergy throughout France.

But the contest was renewed shortly afterwards, by the appearance of an unlucky 'Apologie pour les Casuistes contre les calomnies des Jansénistes,' from the pen of the Jesuit F. Pirot.* This ill-judged effusion consisted chiefly of vulgar ridicule and personal abuse; in point of reasoning it was wretchedly feeble; and its effect was to injure instead of furthering the cause it meant to advocate. A violent outcry arose against it from all parts of the country. The curés of Paris and Rouen put forth a series of factums or memorials on the subject, which were composed in reality by the Port Royalists—Pascal, Arnauld, Nicole, and Hermant, being the principal writers. The 'Apology' was disavowed officially by the Jesuits, according to their custom in such emergencies. They declared that Pirot had acted on his own responsibility, contrary to the advice of his superiors; and the unfortunate author was so deeply wounded by this treatment, that he fell into a lingering sickness which brought him to his grave. His work was referred to the Sorbonne, and was condemned by that body in July, 1658. This was followed immediately by a censure from the vicars-general of the Archbishop of Paris;† and corresponding measures were taken in all the other dioceses, with some few exceptions, to express the strong disapproval with which the French clergy viewed the corrupt principles and practices complained of. The Bishops of Pamiers, Alet, Comminges, Angers, and Vence, all well known for their Jansenist sympathies, distinguished themselves by strongly-worded mandements on this occasion. In 1659 the 'Apology' likewise incurred the censure of the Inquisition at Rome.

The 'Provinciales' thus enabled the Port Royalists to turn the tables with damaging effect on their opponents, and also did good service to the Church at large by exposing the dangerous sophistries of false teachers. There were, however, considerable deductions from the completeness of this triumph. It was felt in many quarters, that although individual authors might have been extravagant and reprehensible in treating casuistical questions, and might have sanctioned doctrines of an injurious

* B. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xiii. Pt. ii. Art. xxxv.

† De Retz, it must be remembered, was disposed to favour the Jansenists;

and the administration of the diocese, in his absence, was, to a great extent, under their influence.

tendency, it would be grossly unjust to throw the blame of this, exclusively and undividedly, upon the Jesuit body.* Casuistry was not a science peculiar to the Jesuits, although it was true that members of that Society had cultivated it with pre-eminent success. The charge of teaching false morality might be substantiated quite as easily from the writings of Dominicans, Franciscans, and other religious schools, as from those of the disciples of Loyola. Considering the multitude of divines who had handled the subject at various times and in different countries, it would be strange if they had not been occasionally misled into erroneous decisions; but the Jesuits, as an Order, could not fairly be held responsible for these mistakes; that Society had repudiated and condemned them, by the sentence of its highest authority, long before they had fallen under the lash of Port Royal. It was alleged, moreover, that in numbers of instances the author of the 'Provinciales' had been guilty of misquotation, mistranslation, and malicious perversion of the true sense of the writings which he criticized; and that the worst imputations against the Casuists were founded on mere fragments detached from their context, and cited in that form solely for the sake of exciting odium. These complaints, which were to a certain extent supported by clear proof, were not without weight in the mind of the more calmly-judging part of the community, though insufficient to counterbalance the general effect of Pascal's inimitable Letters. The feeling against them first found public expression in a decree of the Parliament of Aix, in Provence, in March, 1657, which stigmatized the volume as "full of calumnies, falsehoods, forgeries, and libels," and condemned it to be burnt by the executioner. After this, several prelates animadverted upon it in their pastoral addresses; and in September, 1657, it was branded by the censure of the Inquisition, and placed on the Index, in company with the two famous letters of Antoine Arnauld. Two years later Pascal's work, which had been admirably translated into Latin, with notes, by Nicole, under the assumed name of Guillaume Wendrock, was

* An unprejudiced critic, the Protestant Schoell, gives the following estimate of the *Provinciales*:—"C'est un ouvrage de parti, où la mauvaise foi attribue au Jésuites des opinions suspectes que depuis longtemps ils avaient

blâmées, et qui mit sur le compte de toute la Société certaines extravagances de quelques Pères Espagnols et Flamands." *Cours d'Histoire des Etats Européens*, vol. xxviii. p. 79.

denounced by the Parliament of Bordeaux; and the case having been argued, the court determined, before giving judgment, to refer the book to the Theological Faculty of the University for its opinion. That body, after due examination, pronounced the Letters of Montalte to be free from doctrinal heresy, and, with regard to morals, commended them in the highest terms. Upon this the Jesuits, who were still all-powerful at Court, procured a royal ordonnance naming a Commission of bishops and divines to scrutinize the work afresh; and in time a report appeared, affirming that the heresies of Jansenius, already condemned by the Church, were maintained and defended in the Letters of Montalte, in the Notes of Wendrock, and in the Disquisitions of Paulus Irenæus (another sobriquet adopted by Nicole), and that accordingly these writings had justly incurred the legal penalties against heretical and libellous publications. Thereupon an arrêt of the Council of State ordered the said writings to be publicly torn and burned by the "Exécuteur de haute justice," which sentence was carried into effect on the 14th of October, 1660.*

Such, however, is the transcendent power of genius, that neither royal commissions, nor judicial condemnations, nor even the thunders of the Vatican itself, prevailed to dethrone the Provincial Letters from their lofty place in popular estimation. The attempts made on the part of the Jesuits to refute them showed so decided an inferiority of intellectual gifts, that for the most part they were utter failures. The only apologist for the Order who seems to have produced any impression on the public mind was Father Daniel, author of the well-known 'History of France;' who, in his 'Entretiens de Cléanthe et d'Eudoxe,' written in 1694, exposed with considerable force the mistakes and unjust imputations into which Pascal had been betrayed. This book was eagerly read, the whole of the first edition disappearing almost instantaneously.† It was reprinted several times, and was translated into Italian and other languages

* D'Argentré, *Coll. Jud.*, tom. iii. p. 294. B. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xii. Pt. i. Art. 21.

† "La reponse aux Provinciales par le P. Daniel Jésuite a disparu quasi avant que de paraître. Elle ne coûtait que 50 sols, et l'on dit qu'on a offert

d'en rendre un louis d'or de 24 francs ceux qui l'avoient acheté, s'ils vouloient la rendre. On a dit qu'on n'a pas voulu la laisser paraître, choquant comme elle est pour M. Nicole." *Bayle Œuvres Diverses*, tom. iv. p. 711.

The style was judicious, the reasoning powerful, the facts adduced indisputable ; and yet all these recommendations failed to secure a permanent triumph over such an antagonist as Pascal. Father Daniel established beyond contradiction many particular instances of misrepresentation, exaggeration, calumnious aspersion, and malicious suppression of the truth ; but of the multitudes who had laughed over the libel, not one in a thousand ever saw the reply by which it was demolished ; nor, indeed, could it be expected that cold, sober, unimpassioned argument should undo the effect which had been created by brilliant wit and scathing sarcasm. Hence the verdict originally pronounced on the Provincial Letters by the generation to which the writer addressed himself has never since been reversed.

Whether the theory based on the subtle distinction between the “droit” and the “fait” was ever really embraced by the singularly candid mind of Pascal is a point of psychology which we have no means of determining with certainty. It is probable that on first embarking in the controversy, he adopted, without examination, the line of defence devised by his Jansenist friends, conscious that he was not sufficiently well versed in theology to frame a system for himself. But it is a remarkable fact that subsequently, as the result of mature thought, he was led to a very different conclusion. In the seventeenth of the Provincial Letters he admits, like all the rest of the party, that the Five Propositions were heretical and rightly condemned, but denies that they expressed the opinions of Jansenius ; upon this latter point, being a question of *fact*, he contends that it is lawful to demur to the decision of the Holy See, since the gift of infallibility extends only to matters of dogmatic faith. But in the sequel he abandoned this position as untenable ; and declared that the Vatican had condemned the doctrine of efficacious grace,* which was undoubtedly the doctrine of Jansenius, and not only of Jansenius, but of St. Augustine and St. Paul. He held, accordingly, that the Popes had erred, *not* in a question of fact, but in an *article of faith* : that they had condemned an essential Christian verity. And, in consequence, the faithful could not, in his judgment, accept a Formulary which solemnly abjured

* This, however, was a mistake. The Papal bull did not condemn the efficaciousness of grace, but the doctrine that it cannot be resisted.

all that the Apostolic See had condemned, without express *excepting* the so-called "sense of Jansenius" as to the Five Propositions. This change of sentiment placed Pascal in opposition to the Port Royalists, and caused a certain coldness and estrangement between them. Various explanatory statements were exchanged,* but Pascal's views were now those of sincere personal conviction, and he maintained them unflinchingly to the end. His sister Jacqueline (Sœur St. Euphémie), a person of eminent saintliness of mind and character, had discovered, as she conceived, the true force of the Papal decision before it became apparent to her brother; hence the famous Formulary which was imposed on the Church in 1660 as an anti-Jansenist test, was to her an object of conscientious and profound abhorrence. Yielding, after a long struggle, to the authority and specious reasoning of her spiritual guides, the noble-minded Jacqueline subscribed the Formulary in July, 1661; but the mental distress occasioned by this act, and the remorse which followed, rapidly undermined her health, and on the 4th of October in the same year she sank into the grave. This tragic end of a sister to whom he was tenderly attached made an indelible impression upon Pascal, and no doubt shortened his own life. A scene of ostensible, but, as it would seem, incomplete reconciliation with Arnauld and Nicole took place in his dying chamber; and, without retracting his dissent from the authoritative sentence of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pascal expired on the 19th of August, 1662. But we are anticipating the order of events.

* *Œuvres de Pascal*, tom. iii. p. 607.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE Assembly of the French clergy, judging it needful to take measures for enforcing submission to the Papal bulls against Jansenism, adopted that of a Formulary, to be signed by all ecclesiastics and religious houses. Such a proceeding was one of questionable wisdom, and could only be justified by the extreme urgency of existing circumstances. It was defended on the ground of the necessity of withstanding the insubordination of the recusant party, and as a safe-guard against schism in the National Church, which there seemed too much reason to apprehend. Its effects, however, as we shall see, were to prolong and exasperate the already passionate strife of parties.

The task of drawing up the Formulary was entrusted by the synod of 1656 to Pierre de Marca, Archbishop of Toulouse, the distinguished author of the treatise ‘*De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii*.’ That prelate prepared a draft accordingly, which was approved by the Assembly; and information of the proposed step was immediately despatched to Rome. Alexander VII. replied by the bull “*Ad sacram*,” dated October 16th, 1656, which confirmed those of his predecessor, and denounced as “disturbers of public peace and children of iniquity” those who pretended that the Five Propositions were not to be found in Jansenius. Alexander declared, moreover, that the Propositions were condemned *in the sense of Jansenius*;—“*in sensu ab eodem Cornelio intento*.” This bull was not received by the French synod till the 17th of March, 1657; when it was resolved to modify the form of subscription, so as to include the latest communication from the Holy See.*

The following were the terms finally agreed upon:—“I, the undersigned, do submit sincerely to the constitution of Pope Innocent X., of the 31st May, 1653, according to its true

* *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 312.

signification, which has been determined by the constitution of our Holy Father Pope Alexander VII., of the 16th of October 1656. I acknowledge myself bound in conscience to obey these constitutions, and I condemn with heart and mouth the doctrine of the Five Propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, contained in his book entitled ‘Augustinus,’ which has been condemned by the two Popes and by the bishops; the said doctrine being not that of St. Augustine, but a misinterpretation of it by Jansenius, contrary to the meaning of that great doctor.”

At the request of the Assembly a Royal message was sent to the Parliament, directing them to register the bull “*Ad sacram*,” and announcing at the same time that all ecclesiastics would be expected to subscribe the Formulary within the space of a month. Corresponding instructions were forwarded to the provincial Parliaments; and the tribunals were forbidden to entertain any appeal *comme d’abus* which might be presented on this subject. Lastly, a circular letter from the Assembly to the members of the French episcopate exhorted them to enforce conformity with these regulations in their several dioceses.

The bull of Pope Alexander was accordingly published throughout France, and the prescribed notice given with regard to the subscription of the Formulary. But the bishops universally abstained from insisting on a literal application of the test. The vicars-general of the diocese of Paris, who, as already noticed, were partisans of the Jansenists, openly impugned the Formulary as containing falsehoods and absurdities; and re-echoed the hackneyed arguments by which the friends had so long striven to evade the plain meaning of the Papal decrees. The Government did not interpose to press compliance; and the result was that the Formulary remained a dead letter for upwards of three years.

The publication of the bull “*Ad sacram*” added seriously to the difficulties of the Jansenist position. Hitherto it had been pleaded that the Five Propositions did not express the sentiments of Jansenius; that his teaching was none other than that of St. Augustine, which the Pope himself had declared to be untouched by the decision; and that, in consequence, the doctrine of Jansenius had not been condemned at all. But

this ground could no longer be maintained; it was now distinctly ruled that the Propositions were condemned in the very sense in which Jansenius held and published them. Hence, if it should be made compulsory to sign a Formulary embodying this statement, the only choice open to the Jansenists would lie between rejecting the authoritative judgment of the Apostolic see, and subscribing what they believed in their consciences to be untrue. Antoine Arnauld, perplexed by this dilemma, gave vent to his feelings in a pamphlet which he entitled ‘Cas proposé par un docteur, touchant la signature de la Constitution d’Alexandre VII., et du Formulaire du Clergé.’ It was addressed to Nicolas Pavillon, Bishop of Alet, whom the writer professed to consult for the removal of his scruples; but it would seem that in reality his mind was already made up as to the course to be pursued.

The following questions were propounded for solution:—First, whether a divine hitherto firmly convinced that the Propositions are not in Jansenius, and are not condemned in the sense of that writer, is bound to change his opinions in consequence of the Papal bull and the deliberations of the clergy of France? Secondly, whether the same divine, still retaining his persuasion that Jansenius has taught no other doctrine than that of St. Augustine, can nevertheless subscribe the Formulary? Lastly, whether it is allowable, considering all the circumstances, to preserve a respectful *silence* with regard to the bull, under the impression that the Pope may have been misinformed as to the matter of fact involved in the charge against Jansenius?

Replying to his own inquiries, Arnauld decided the two former points in the negative, the latter in the affirmative. The Bishop of Alet, however, took the opposite view of the case; and expressed himself of opinion, to the great surprise of the Jansenists, that the individual in question not only might subscribe the Formulary, but ought to do so, notwithstanding his conviction of the orthodoxy of Jansenius; since the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff must override all private sentiments, and although a clear distinction existed between matters of fact and articles of faith, in the case of Jansenius the two questions were so closely interwoven, that it would not be wise or safe to separate them.

Arnauld rejected this unpalatable advice, and pursued the

discussion. In a second letter to the Bishop he urged that the submission due to the Holy See must be limited by the claims of reason, which God has manifestly given for our direction in all important enquiries. He was convinced, by irresistible evidence, that the Pope had acted under a misapprehension of facts in the condemnation of Jansenius. How then could he be expected to accept, contrary to the dictates of his own reason, a conclusion which he knew to be founded upon erroneous premises? Upon a question of simple fact the Pope had no right to claim infallibility; inasmuch then as the judgment in this case was not infallible, it was sufficient to submit to it in silence, retaining at the same time his own conscientious conviction, which indeed it was impossible to alter.

The Bishop of Alet, a man of remarkable honesty and impartiality of mind, was much impressed by these considerations. He resolved to devote himself to a still deeper investigation of the questions at issue; and this scrutiny resulted in an important change of sentiment as to the objections raised by Arnauld, and in general as to the relative position of the contending parties. From that time forward Pavillon was one of the most energetic and unfaltering defenders of the Jansenist cause.

Yet the ground thus taken by the Jansenists, if examined dispassionately, must be pronounced evasive and fallacious. The Pope, on their hypothesis, was infallible in matters of faith, but fallible in questions of fact; and whether Jansenius had broached a certain doctrine in a particular work, they maintained to be purely a question of fact.

But this theory may be taxed with inconsistency. If the supreme Pontiff be infallible in defining dogma, he must be able to declare with equal certainty that such and such dogmas are laid down in a given volume; for this may happen to be the very hinge upon which an entire controversy turns; and in the case of the Five Propositions it was actually so.

If the Pope, though doctrinally incapable of error, may at the same time misapprehend the sense of the writings upon which his decision is sought, it is difficult to perceive in what his infallibility consists. How can he decide questions of dogma, unless he can also interpret works which treat of dogma? To pretend that the interpretation of such works is a question of fact as *opposed*

to one of doctrine, is a mere abuse of language. These are not ordinary facts, but facts which are involved of necessity in controversies of faith; and with respect to *such* facts, it is plain that either the Pope must be able to pronounce unerringly, or that he is not infallible at all. No one, of course, pretended that the Pope can judge of any private ideas or purposes which a man may secretly cherish in his own mind. An author may possibly *believe* the very contrary to that which he has expressed in words; but the Church is concerned only with the natural legitimate sense of his published language; and, on Roman principles, it must be competent to the Pope, acting as the organ of the Church, to determine whether certain opinions have actually been broached, and whether they are or are not in accordance with the Rule of Faith. If every one whom Rome condemns could excuse himself by alleging that the Pope has misunderstood him, and that in point of fact he never entertained such sentiments, it would follow that the judicial functions of the Papal Chair must in course of time be altogether superseded. Heresy might be perpetually condemned, and heretics might nevertheless persist in propagating the self-same errors, on the pretext that their real opinions were totally distinct from those specified in the censure.

Whether it be *true* that the Pope, as an individual, possesses the power of deciding in the name of the Church, without the assistance and consent of a General Council, is another question, which, however momentous, does not enter into the case before us; since, as before observed, the Jansenists professed to acknowledge the Papal infallibility in judgments *de fide*. Thus they occupied a false position; and as the controversy proceeded, it became more and more evident that their system tended logically to the denial of a doctrine which in words they affected to maintain, the infallibility of the Holy See.

This, however, makes it none the less a matter of regret that the French clergy should have taken so ill-judged a course in framing and enforcing the Formulary. Such a policy under such circumstances could have but one, and that a calamitous, issue. The Jesuits, to whose counsels it was chiefly due, had abundant reason to lament in the sequel a measure of which the ultimate reaction fell with disastrous weight upon themselves.

The appearance of a circular letter from Cardinal de Retz,

who from his retreat at Rome intrigued incessantly for the purpose of obtaining favourable terms of accommodation, incensed the Government afresh against the Jansenists in the course of the year 1660.* The offending document was attributed to Arnould; and if not actually penned by him, there is no doubt that in substance it was inspired by Port Royal. Hence Mazarin made it a pretext for insisting on the execution of the harsh enactments against the recusant party. On the meeting of the Assembly in December, 1660, the three presiding prelates were summoned to the Louvre, where the young king informed them that, for the advancement of the glory of God, the repose of his subjects, and his own salvation, he was resolved to extirpate Jansenism from his dominions; and enjoined them to concert with their brethren the means which they might deem most effectual for the accomplishment of this pious purpose. In compliance with this expression of the royal will, the Assembly passed a vote on the 1st of February, 1661, by which the signature of the Formulary was made absolutely obligatory upon the whole clergy secular and regular, upon members of religious Orders, nuns as well as monks, and even upon directors of colleges and schools.

On the 13th of April this resolution was confirmed by an arrêt of the Council of State; and Louis added a circular letter to the bishops, exhorting them to carry into immediate execution the measures prescribed by the Assembly. A letter to the same effect was sent to the Sorbonne, and was obeyed without hesitation; the Faculty ordered that the Formulary should be subscribed by all doctors and bachelors of theology, and by all candidates for degrees.

Cardinal Mazarin did not live to see the result of these unwise proceedings. After a tenure of supreme power which had lasted, with very brief intervals, for eighteen years, he expired on the 9th of March, 1661; leaving behind him a reputation which ill became his exalted station in the Church. As he had always shown himself decidedly hostile to the Jansenists,

* In this letter De Retz indulged in bitter invectives against Mazarin, and hinted that, if justice were still denied him, he should be compelled to resort to extreme measures, which he had hitherto forbore to employ, from un-

willingness to add to the difficulties of the State during the war. This was supposed to point to an interdict upon the diocese of Paris. *Mémoires de Joly*, tom. i.

they imagined at first that his death might turn to their advantage; but a very short time sufficed to dispel this illusion. They had an enemy in the highest quarter.

The circumstances of his education, and the traditions of the administration of Richelieu, had inspired Louis XIV. with a strong antipathy to Jansenism, which he had learned to regard in the light of an organized opposition to his authority. Accordingly, it became plain, from the moment when he took the government into his own hands, that if there was one principle of policy upon which he was more determined than another, it was the complete humiliation and extinction of this disaffected party in the Church. One of his first acts was to appoint a "council of conscience," as it was called, to which he entrusted the chief management of ecclesiastical affairs, including the presentation to vacant bishoprics and benefices. The persons who composed this board were Pierre de Marca, Archbishop of Toulouse; Hardouin de Péréfixe, then Bishop of Rodez and afterwards Archbishop of Paris; and Father Annat, the king's Jesuit confessor. The selection of such names was a tolerably clear intimation to the friends of Port Royal of the treatment they might expect for the future.

It was not to be expected that the Formulary would be acquiesced in by the Jansenists without a desperate resistance. Loud complaints were made in various quarters against the Assembly, for having exceeded the bounds of its authority in framing a new confession of faith, and dictating to the bishops in the administration of their dioceses. Under pretence of upholding the discipline of the Church, such a proceeding, it was urged, subverted its most fundamental principles. Others declared that the signature of the Formulary would involve an act of positive heresy; since, in condemning Jansenius, it condemned by implication St. Augustine, and thus opened the door to all the errors of Pelagianism. The Vicars-general of the diocese of Paris, though not venturing openly to contravene the orders of the Sovereign, published an ordonnance for the signature which differed considerably from the form drawn up by the Assembly. They alleged that the only question discussed at Rome was whether the Five Propositions were in themselves orthodox, or the contrary; and hence they concluded that, with regard to the "fact of Jansenius," nothing more was requisite

than a respectful acceptance of the Papal constitutions. This was virtually to recognize the validity of the Jansenist distinction between the *fait* and the *droit*; and was therefore a mere evasion of the meaning of the Formulary. The Assembly of the Clergy denounced this document to the king, and his Majesty, having caused it to be examined by certain prelates, declared it null and void, as contrary to the decisions of the Holy See, and ordered it to be revoked. The parochial clergy of Paris, on the other hand, published an official statement testifying that, so far from causing offence, the mandement had been received with feelings of gratitude and edification by themselves and the faithful to whom they ministered.

The Vicars-general appealed to Rome; and Alexander responded on the 1st of August by a brief rebuking them strongly for having advanced a manifest falsehood, in saying that the question of the authorship of Jansenius had not been examined or decided at Rome. The Pope commanded them to revoke their mandement as soon as they received his brief, under pain of the heaviest censures. After some hesitation, they obeyed; and issued on the 31st of October a second ordonnance, in terms precisely conformable to the resolution of the Assembly; requiring the signature of the Formulary "pure et simple," without any attempt to distinguish between the *droit* and the *fait*.

The Court, instigated by the Jesuits, now commenced a relentless persecution of the two convents of Port Royal. In April, 1661, an armed force, headed by the lieutenant-civil, expelled from both houses the pensioners, novices, and postulants, and ordered that none should be admitted for the future. A *lettre de cachet* was signed, banishing Singlin, the director, to Quimper in Brittany; but timely notice having been forwarded to him, he escaped before it could be executed. A new Superior and confessor was imposed on the two communities, and installed by the Grand Vicar on the 17th of May. Two priests were appointed to act under him, belonging to the Seminary of S. Nicolas du Chardonnet, an institution notoriously adverse to the Jansenists. The schools of Port Royal, which had acquired such celebrity under the management of Lancelot, Nicole, Le Maître, and Floriot, were at the same time finally closed.

The next stroke was to compel the unfortunate nuns to subscribe the Formulary. It was tendered to them in the first instance in the terms of the mandement originally issued by the Vicars-general; which, indeed, had been composed chiefly with a view to facilitate the acceptance of the test by their party. The sisters of the Paris convent signed without much difficulty; but at Port Royal des Champs the struggle was painfully severe. Many of its inmates felt that they could not comply without violating the plain dictates of conscience; they were incompetent to decide for themselves the merits of the questions in dispute; and they were sorely perplexed by a division of opinion which arose at this crisis among the leading members of their own party.* They signed at length, with heavy hearts, on the 23rd of June; but to several of them this most needless piece of cruelty was a blow from which they never recovered. One of the victims, as before related, was the admirable sister of Pascal, the Sœur de Ste. Euphémie. The Mère Angélique herself, who had long been sinking under the ravages of a mortal disease, survived the distressing scene only a few weeks. During her last illness she edified all around her by her extraordinary patience, deep humility, and unshaken confidence in God;—qualities the more remarkable, since the forcible removal of Singlin, De Sacy, and Ste. Marthe, her much-valued spiritual advisers, had left her in a grievous state of mental dejection and desolation. The saintly Abbess entered into her rest on the 6th of August, 1661, in the seventieth year of her age.

But the Jesuits, not satisfied with having extorted from Port Royal this act of qualified submission, insisted that nothing would suffice short of accepting the Formulary “pure et simple,” according to the tenor of the last-received mandate from Rome. This was demanded accordingly; and the sisterhood proceeded to debate, in a state of extreme embarrassment and agitation, as to the course to be pursued. Their conclusion was that it was impossible to comply without adding an *explication*, signifying in substance that they cordially adopted all decisions of the Holy See in points of faith, but declining to pledge themselves to a like submission as to other matters.† This

* See above, p. 441.

† The following was their declaration (dated November 26, 1661):—
“ Nous Abbesses, Prieures et Religieuses

was pronounced unsatisfactory, and the nuns were admonished that they must sign the test in the precise shape in which it was offered to them, without qualification or explanation of any kind.

At this juncture, when Port Royal seemed on the very brink of final ruin, events occurred which once more procured a respite of some duration for the persecuted party. Early in the year 1662 a reconciliation was effected between Cardinal de Retz and the Court, on which occasion that prelate resigned the archbishopric of Paris. His vicars-general, in consequence, vacated their office ipso facto; and their ordonnance for the signature of the Formulary was no longer in force. The learned De Marca was nominated to succeed, but some time necessarily elapsed before he was in a position to enter on his functions; and at the moment when the bulls of institution at length arrived, the new archbishop was suddenly attacked by a mortal sickness, and expired three days afterwards, on the 27th of June. Upon this the king resolved to transfer Hardouin Beaumont de Péréfixe, who had formerly been his preceptor, from the see of Rodez to that of the metropolis. But unforeseen circumstances occasioned fresh delays; an insult offered to the French ambassador at Rome, the Duc de Créqui, by the Pope's Corsican guard, became a subject of serious dispute between the two courts, and at one time threatened to produce an open rupture. The Papal Chancery was intractable; and nearly two years elapsed before Péréfixe received the bulls completing his new dignity. Thus the diocese remained still under provisional government.

Meanwhile several of the French bishops, and those not the least eminent for ability, learning, and piety, expressed with honest freedom their repugnance to the Formulary, and deprecated its execution. The venerable Pavillon, Bishop of Alet, took the lead. In an energetic letter to Vialart, Bishop of Châlons, he

des deux Monastères de Port Royal de Paris et des Champs, assemblées capitulairement en chacune des deux maisons, pour satisfaire à l'Ordonnance de Mrs. les Vicaires-généraux de Monseigneur le Cardinal de Retz du dernier Octobre 1661, considérant que dans l'ignorance où nous sommes de toutes les choses qui sont au dessus de notre profession et de notre sexe, tout ce que nous pouvons faire est de rendre

témoignage de la pureté de nôtre foi; Nous déclarons très volontiers par nôtre signature qu'étant soumises avec un profond respect à N. S. P. le Pape, et n'ayant rien de si précieux que la foi, nous embrassons sincèrement et de cœur tout ce que Sa Sainteté et le Pape Innocent X. en ont décidé, et rejetons toutes les erreurs qu'ils ont jugé y être contraires."

maintained that no bishop who entertained a due respect for his office could either sign, or require others to sign, the Formulary prescribed by the Assembly; inasmuch as that body had no authority to dictate to the Church a new article of faith, particularly an article consisting not of any divinely-revealed truth, but of a mere historical fact. Pavillon wrote in a similar strain to the king and the Assembly. Another of the remonstrants was Henri Arnauld, Bishop of Angers, who insisted, in a letter to the king, that for facts which are not directly revealed, the Church has no right to demand religious or "divine" faith; such absolute submission being due to the Word of God alone. Godeau, Bishop of Vence, represented to Louis that the so-called Jansenist heresy was nothing but a phantom or chimera, invented by malicious persons for the purpose of crushing those who differed from them in sentiment; that the pretended Jansenists were sincere and orthodox Catholics; and that the Formulary, far from promoting unity, would only serve to aggravate, prolong, and embitter the conflict which unhappily existed. Statements to the same effect were made by the Bishops of Beauvais and Comminges. Most of the above-named prelates applied likewise to the Pope for special directions how to proceed under the circumstances; but the only reply vouchsafed by his Holiness was to refer them to his brief recently addressed to the Vicars-general of Paris.

The real views of the Ultramontane school as to the extent of the infallibility of the Pope were curiously illustrated by a thesis in divinity maintained at the Jesuit college of Clermont on the 12th of December, 1661. It was thus expressed: "Christ, when about to ascend into heaven, committed first to Peter, and then to his successors, the supreme government of the Church, and invested them with the very same infallibility which He Himself possessed, as often as they should speak *ex cathedrâ*. There is, consequently, in the Roman Church an infallible judge of controversies of faith, even independently of a General Council; and that in questions both of doctrine and of fact. Hence, after the decrees of Innocent X. and Alexander VII., it may be believed with *divine* faith that the book entitled the 'Augustinus' of Jansenius is heretical, and that the Five Propositions were extracted from it, and were condemned in the sense intended by the author." Antoine Arnauld, in a vehement

pamphlet, denounced this extravagant doctrine to the bishops; but neither the civil nor ecclesiastical authorities thought proper to interfere. A few months later, however, the same sentiment having been repeated in a thesis at the Sorbonne, and again at the college of the Bernardins, the Parliament of Paris took courage, and pronounced against the offenders with all its ancient vigour. The first thesis was summarily suppressed; all parties concerned in it were severely reprimanded, and propositions of that tendency strictly forbidden for the future. The second offence was visited with still heavier penalties; the Syndic of the Faculty being suspended for six months from the exercise of his functions. The Sorbonne drew up on this occasion a statement setting forth, in six articles, the well-known tradition of the Gallican Church with regard to the authority of the Pope. This document having been presented to the king and the Parliament, a royal ordonnance was published, enjoining that the said articles should be registered by all the Parliaments and Universities in the kingdom, together with a prohibition to teach or allow any other doctrine on the subject.* It must not be concealed, however, that this display of Gallican zeal coincided with certain political circumstances which gave it peculiar point and emphasis. As often as the public relations between the Courts of France and Rome chanced to be disturbed, his Most Christian Majesty lost no time in re-asserting those immemorial principles which circumscribed the Pontifical jurisdiction in respect both of the temporality and the spirituality within his dominions.

Louis had lately been compelled to demand satisfaction for an insult offered to the Duke de Créqui, his ambassador at Rome, by the Pope's Corsican guard. They had fired upon the carriage of the ambassadress, and killed or wounded several of her attendants. Upon this the king seized Avignon and the county of the Venaissin, and ordered a body of troops to cross the Alps and march upon Rome. An accommodation was arranged, however, in the following year, upon terms deeply mortifying to the Papal See.

* D'Argentré, *Collect. Judic.*, tom. iii. p. 327. Ellies-Dupin, *H. E. du XVII. Siècle*, tom. i. p. 149. D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. ii. p. 420. These

six articles formed the basis of those promulgated by the famous Assembly of 1682.

The same circumstances may, perhaps, serve to explain a singular negotiation which was undertaken about this period, with a view to bring about a mutual understanding between the antagonist parties in the Church, and thus to terminate the controversy. The Jesuits, fearing for their own interests in case the king should proceed to extremities in his quarrel with Rome, may have thought it prudent to conciliate a party which might at no distant day succeed to a position of great influence and power.

Whatever the motive may have been, it is certain that, towards the close of 1662, F. Annat, with the sanction of the king, opened communications with Gilbert de Choiseul, Bishop of Comminges, an intimate friend of the Arnaulds, and begged him to confer with F. Ferrier, a learned Jesuit, professor of theology at Toulouse, whom he would find anxiously desirous to promote the good work of reconciliation.* A preliminary interview took place accordingly between the bishop and the Jesuit at Toulouse; and it was agreed, after reference to the Jansenist leaders, that the proposed conferences should forthwith commence, with an understanding that the Formulary should be left entirely out of the question, and that nothing should be demanded of the Jansenists that could offend their conscientious convictions.

The bishop and Ferrier proceeded to Paris; and the king gave permission to Arnauld, Singlin, Taignier, and the Abbé de St. Cyran (M. de Barcos), who were still in concealment, to reappear in the capital, with an assurance of perfect safety pending the conferences. They declined, however, to accept this favour; and two divines of high reputation, La Lanne and Girard, were deputed to act on this occasion on behalf of their friends.

It was proposed on the part of the Jansenists, that they should draw up five articles bearing on the points of doctrine contained in the five condemned propositions, and that in these articles they should express distinctly their own sentiments with

* According to Racine's account (*Hist. de Port Royal*, p. 199) the first overtures came from F. Ferrier, whom he describes as an artful, ambitious man, actuated chiefly by the desire of making himself conspicuous, and gain-

ing the appointment of confessor at court. Gerberon, on the other hand, asserts that the project of reunion was started by the Bishop of Comminges. (*Histoire du Jansenisme*, tom. iii. p. 31.)

regard to the aforesaid doctrines; if their views should be accepted by the other side, all ground of dispute would disappear at once, and nothing would remain to hinder the re-establishment of peace. This was agreed to; and on the 23rd of January, 1663, La Lanne and Girard produced a document in which the controverted questions were treated in close accordance with the system usually known as that of the Thomists—which latter, while differing widely from that of the Molinists, had been repeatedly approved by Popes and Councils, and had always been held admissible in the Church. The new Jansenist articles recognized the distinction between “*grâce actuelle*” or “*suffisante*,” and “*grâce efficace*;” they repudiated the notion of necessitant grace; and they declared that grace, if short of effectual grace, may be resisted by the human will.* These were large concessions; concessions which, had they been made in good faith ten years before, might have averted untold calamities from the Church of France. The affair looked hopeful, and the good Bishop of Comminges already began to congratulate himself on the success of his charitable enterprise.

F. Ferrier, on examining the Jansenist statement, took exception to certain expressions in the first article; but this difficulty having been removed by the addition of a few words in explanation, he declared himself perfectly satisfied; and as the other articles were unobjectionable, he could not but confess that the Jansenist doctrine as a whole coincided with that of the Church. But instead of proceeding to concert measures for a definite peace, the Jesuit now presented to La Lanne and Girard five articles drawn up by himself, which contained, he said, the sense in which the heretical Propositions had been condemned by the Pope. These he proposed that the deputies should abjure in writing, in testimony of their adhesion to the sentence passed by the Holy See; in that case, he added, no demand would be made upon them with regard to the question of *fact*; they would not be expected to declare that the here-

* “*Secunda (gratia) ea est quam tum excitantem, tum inefficacem, tum sufficientem idem significantibus verbis vocant; huic verè resistit ac renititur voluntas, eamque eo effectui privat ad quem excitat, et ad quem potestatem largitur. Potest quidem illi voluntas*

consentire, nec tamen, si absit gratia efficax, unquam consentit; non defectu antecedentis potestatis, sed liberâ sui ipsius in oppositum determinatione.” See D’Argentré, *Collect. Judic.*, tom. iii. p. 306.

tical doctrine was that of Jansenius, nor to subscribe his condemnation by name. The deputies complied without difficulty; and after this both parties appear to have looked forward confidently to a final pacification.

But at the next meeting this fair prospect was overclouded by a debate which arose upon the precise point where agreement was utterly hopeless; namely, the necessity of condemning the Propositions *in the sense intended by their author*. The “sense of Jansenius” had been for years the real apple of discord between the rival parties; and it proved an insurmountable obstacle to the success of the present negotiation.

The Bishop of Comminges,—finding that no progress was made, and that, in spite of the express stipulation to the contrary at the commencement of the conferences, the question of *fact* had become the prominent, indeed the sole, issue to be decided,—devised another method of proceeding, by which he conceived that an accommodation might still be effected. He proposed that F. Ferrier should transmit to the Pope the five articles of the Jansenists, together with a formula setting forth their profound respect for his Holiness, and their cordial submission to all the decisions of the Apostolic See. Ferrier, who seems to have been personally sincere in desiring to make peace, consented, but others of his Order interfered to oppose the design, and intrigued without scruple to bring about a rupture of the conferences; and the result was that when the deputies next assembled, Ferrier told them plainly that no arrangement was possible unless they would declare that they condemned the Five Propositions in the sense specified by the Papal constitutions; that is, the sense of Jansenius. This sacrifice they did not feel at liberty to make; and in consequence the scheme of reconciliation fell to the ground. The Bishop of Comminges, however, at the desire of the Jansenist commissioners, despatched their profession of faith to Rome, accompanied by an act of unconditional submission to the Pope’s authority and judgment. Alexander thereupon named a special congregation to examine the articles, and they were quickly pronounced to be ambiguous, illogical, and inadmissible. A brief was addressed to the French prelates on the 29th of July, in which the Pope applauded their zeal for the truth, congratulated them on their success in bringing the Jansenists to a better mind, and exhorted them to

employ all the means at their command for carrying into complete effect the decisions of the Holy See in the two constitutions against Jansenius.

La Lanne and Girard, when called upon to redeem their promise by conforming themselves to the renewed demand of the Holy Father as signified in his brief, placed in the hands of the Bishop of Comminges a second declaration, signifying that they rejoiced in the implied approbation of their doctrine conveyed by the terms of the Papal brief, that they were ready to sign a condemnation of the Five Propositions in any words which his Holiness might prescribe, but that, as their act of submission did not bind them to anything repugnant to truth and conscience, they could not, without distinction and qualification, abjure the "sense of Jansenius." The Bishop presented this memorial to the king on the 24th of September, and then withdrew, deeply grieved and mortified, to his remote diocese in Languedoc.

Such was the abortive issue of these conferences, which created a considerable sensation at the time. The inflexible Antoine Arnauld, who profoundly distrusted the sincerity of any overtures proceeding from the Jesuits, retired from the negociation soon after its commencement; which circumstance was in itself almost inevitably fatal to the success of the attempt. Arnauld had persisted for so many years in an attitude of stubborn antagonism, that the very notion of *submission*, though on the easiest terms, was to him insupportable. Perhaps it is not too much to say that he preferred strife to peace, at all events if the latter were to be purchased by any semblance of surrender to his adversaries. In vain the Bishop of Comminges assured him that he was not asked to profess an *internal belief* of anything from which his conscience revolted, but only to defer to superior authority as a matter of external ecclesiastical discipline. He replied that such distinctions were not to be reconciled with his views of duty, and remained impracticable.*

Accounts of the Conferences were forthwith published by both parties, abounding with mutual charges of misrepresentation, deception, and calumny. Appeal was thereupon made to the Bishop of Comminges, who, having acted as me-

* See *Lettres d'Antoine Arnauld*, Nos. clx. clxi.; tom. i. p. 476 *et seqq.*

diator throughout, must have been better qualified than any one else to determine on which side the truth lay; but that prelate preserved a resolute silence, and thereby gave reason to presume that his testimony, had he chosen to speak out, would have been unfavourable to those with whose general sentiments and policy he was known to sympathize.

The second declaration of the Jansenist commissioners was laid before the royal "council of conscience," and disallowed as insufficient and evasive; whereupon the king summoned an assembly of prelates to deliberate on the best means of carrying into execution the late brief from Rome. Fifteen archbishops and bishops met at Paris on the 2nd of October, 1663, and determined (though they had obviously no right to dictate to their colleagues) that no better course could be taken than to insist on the immediate and universal signature of the Formulary of the clergy. They besought the king to exert his authority for the attainment of this end. Louis issued his edict accordingly, and proceeded in person to the Parliament on the 15th of April, 1664, to enforce its registration in due form. By this decree his Majesty enjoined that the Formulary should be signed by all ecclesiastics secular and regular, without any privilege of appeal; that the benefices of those who should not have signed it within the space of one month from the publication of the edict should be ipso facto void; and that no one should henceforth be admitted to any ecclesiastical preferment, nor to any degrees or offices in the Universities, nor to make profession in any monastery, without having first subscribed the test. He concluded with a general prohibition of all books and writings already or hereafter to be published contrary to the bulls of Innocent X. and Alexander VII., the orders of the Assembly of Clergy, and the decrees of the Faculty of Theology of Paris.

The new Archbishop of Paris, having at length (April 20th, 1664) obtained his bulls and entered on his functions, published a mandement enjoining the immediate signature of the Formulary, in pursuance of the royal edict. Péréfixe, though an obsequious courtier, was a man of pacific counsels, and anxious to discover some expedient by which the king's commands might be obeyed without doing violence to the conscientious scruples of the Jansenists. With this view, he drew a

distinction in his mandement between the several kinds and degrees of belief. No one, he observed, except through malice or ignorance, could maintain that the Church had ever demanded for the *fact* of Jansenius a "divine" faith, such as is claimed for the supernatural truths of revelation. All that was asked was a "human" or "ecclesiastical" faith, implying cordial submission of judgment to the supreme spiritual authority.* This, from such a quarter, was a most important declaration, conceding substantially the point for which the Jansenists had all along contended, namely, that the decisions of the Pope on matters of fact stood on different ground from his definitions *de fide*; and condemning, moreover, those who held, as the Jesuits notoriously did, that the *selfsame* quality and degree of faith is due to *all* decisions of the Apostolic See, whether their subject-matter be fact or doctrine. It is strange that, with the latitude of construction thus authorized by their diocesan, the friends of Port Royal should have persisted in opposing the required subscription to the Formulary; for they had often professed themselves willing to sign as an act of canonical obedience or discipline; and the mandement of the archbishop, though varying somewhat in terms, amounted in reality to no more than this. They showed no disposition, however, to accept the olive-branch; on the contrary, they began to write in a strain of caustic sarcasm against the newly-invented theory of "human faith;" and Nicole, in particular, ridiculed it without mercy in a series of letters entitled '*Les Imaginaires*,' which appeared about this time, and formed a kind of sequel to the '*Provinciales*' of Pascal.

The archbishop proceeded in person, on the 9th of June, to Port Royal, attended by his vicar-general, and made an official visitation of the monastery. He interrogated the nuns, replied to their objections with much patience, and exerted all his powers of argument and persuasion to reduce them to compliance. But his endeavours were fruitless; he withdrew, after intimating that three weeks would be allowed them for further consideration, during which he hoped they would profit by the instructions of two ecclesiastics specially appointed for this purpose—Chamillard, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and Father

* D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronolog.*, tom. ii. p. 444.

Esprit of the Oratory. These divines proposed to the sisterhood various forms of submission, expressed in general terms, either of which would have satisfied the archbishop; but insuperable objections were raised to each. At last the community adopted a declaration stating that they accepted with sincere belief the *doctrinal* decision; and that with regard to the *fact*, as they felt themselves incompetent to form any judgment, they maintained the "respectful silence" which best became their condition. They could not, in conscience, testify by a public act that certain heresies were contained in a book which they had never seen: a book, too, written in Latin, of which language they knew nothing.

On the 21st of August the archbishop made his second visit to the convent of Port Royal at Paris. Having assembled the community, he put the question to them individually, whether they were willing to sign the Formulary according to his mandement; and finding them still resolute in their refusal, he upbraided them sharply for their obstinacy,—declared that, "though they might be *puré* as angels, they were proud as devils,"—and ended by interdicting them from the use of the Sacraments. Severe measures followed. In the course of a few days the prelate again made his appearance at the monastery, attended by the lieutenant-civil and other officers, with a formidable array of exempts and archers. He went straight to the chapterhouse, and there, reading from a list the names of twelve of the principal nuns, the abbess among the number, he ordered them to leave the convent forthwith, and enter the carriages which were waiting for them at the gate.* Solemnly protesting against this act of violence, they obeyed; and were removed to other religious houses according to arrangements made previously. They were replaced by sisters of the order of the Visitation, and the Mère Louise Eugénie de Fontaine was appointed abbess. The ejected nuns made their appeal to the Parliament against the proceedings of their diocesan, but the Court interfered, and the affair was evoked to the cognizance of the Council of State, where of course it was quietly suppressed.

The establishment at Port Royal des Champs was visited

* Four of them were members of the Arnauld family.

some months later with the same penalties that had been inflicted on the house at Paris. Péréfixe, as a last resource, commissioned the famous Bossuet, at that time archdeacon and canon of Metz, to confer with the contumacious nuns, in the hope that his eloquence might win them over to a more reasonable mind. The accomplished abbé spared no pains to convince them that, according to the terms of the archbishop's mandement, they were not required to embrace the fact of Jansenius by a conscious act of the understanding, but only to acquiesce in the Pope's decision out of deference to his authority.* But he laboured in vain; the sisters had become ambitious of the honours of martyrdom; rather than yield an inch of ground to their oppressors, they preferred incurring the extreme sentence of excommunication, which was launched against them accordingly, and remained in force for several years, until the "peace of Clement IX."

The signature of the Formulary, meanwhile, made comparatively little progress throughout France. The fearless Pavillon, who deemed the whole proceeding uncanonical and illegal, and could not reconcile his conscience to half-measures, solemnly prohibited its execution in his diocese, and even excommunicated some of his clergy who, contrary to his orders, had taken the test before the civil magistrates. For this he was denounced to the Parliament, in a violent speech, by Omer Talon, the advocate-general; and an arrêt of that body suppressed a somewhat intemperate letter which he had written to the king. It was stoutly maintained, by the opponents of the Formulary, that the Pope himself disapproved the step taken by the clergy in imposing it; that he had avoided all mention of it in his briefs, and that his opinion of the measure was also manifest from his own conduct, since he had not thought it necessary to exact any such test of orthodoxy at Rome. Louis XIV., finding himself embarrassed by these allegations, requested the Pope to prescribe a new form of subscription, and

* Bossuet's *Lettre aux Religieuses de Port Royal* was not published till five years after his death. The Abbé Le Dieu (*Journal sur la vie de Bossuet*) states his belief that it was never forwarded to its destination; and, as regards the sisters, this is a charitable

supposition, since the principal points connected with their duty on the occasion are there handled in so masterly a style that submission could scarcely have failed to follow in minds honestly open to conviction.

to insist upon its execution by the bishops and clergy of France. Nothing could be more acceptable to the Court of Rome than such an application; for nothing could be better calculated to support the pretensions of the See to universal dominion and infallible authority. A bull was despatched to France without delay, dated February 15, 1665, embodying a Formulary almost identical in terms with that of the bishops,* and enjoining that it should be signed universally within three months after its publication; in default of which the recusants would be proceeded against with the utmost rigour prescribed by the canons.† The bull was confirmed by a royal declaration, and registered in Parliament on the 29th of April.

The bishops now felt bound to proceed in earnest; and in every diocese measures were taken for enforcing subscription. But the mandements issued for this purpose varied considerably; some prelates demanded compliance "purement et simplement," without any distinction between the droit and the fait; others expressly sanctioned such distinction, requiring a submission by "divine faith" for the doctrine, and of external respect, as a matter of discipline, for the fact. The Archbishop of Paris, whose theory of "human faith" had by this time sunk into general discredit, abandoned that term on the present occasion, and adopted the ambiguous phrase of "sincere acquiescence;" which might be construed by Ultramontanes as equivalent to "divine faith," while Jansenists might take advantage of it to subscribe the test without any real belief at all.

The courageous Bishop of Alet, disdaining to equivocate under such circumstances, published a mandement on the 1st of June, in which his views as to the limits of Church authority were set forth with transparent clearness. Truths revealed by God, of which the Church is the ordained guardian, must be accepted on her testimony with an entire subjection of the reason and of all

* The following is the text of the Formulary as prescribed by Alexander VII.:—"Ego N. Constitutioni Apostolicæ Innocentii X., datæ die 31 Mai, 1653, et Constitutioni Alexandri VII., datæ 16 Octobris, 1656, summorum Pontificum, me subjecio, et quinque propositiones ex Cornelii Jansenii libro, cui nomen Augustinus, excerptas, et in

sensu ab eodem authore intento, prout illas per dictas Constitutiones Sedes Apostolica damnavit, sincero animo rejicio ac damno, et ita juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei Evangelia."

† See the bull "Regiminis Apostolici," in the *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. i. p. 365.

the faculties of the mind ; but with regard to other truths, not so revealed, God has not provided any infallible arbiter ; so that when the Church declares that certain propositions are contained in a given book, or that such and such is the meaning of a particular author, she acts only by *human* knowledge, and may be mistaken. For decisions of this kind the Church cannot require positive internal belief ; nevertheless the faithful are not permitted to question or impugn her judgments, which in all cases must be treated with submission, for the preservation of due order and discipline. The high character and saintly life of Pavillon added infinite weight to his pastoral instructions. His sentiments were shared by other prelates, particularly by Henri Arnould, Bishop of Angers, Nicolas Choart de Buzanval, Bishop of Beauvais, and François de Caulet, Bishop of Pamiers ; these issued mandements of precisely similar import, as did also the Bishops of Noyon and Laon ; but the two latter, on receiving notice of the displeasure of the Court, retracted, and adopted a tone of exact accordance with the Papal bull. An arrêt of the Council of State, on the 20th of July, cancelled the mandements of the four refractory bishops, and forbade the clergy to obey them.*

It was determined to take judicial proceedings against the prelates who had thus boldly constituted themselves the apostles of Jansenism ; but this was an affair of considerable delicacy and difficulty. According to Roman jurisprudence, the Pope was the sole judge of bishops ; on the other hand, it was one of the most cherished of the Gallican liberties, that bishops in France could only be tried, in the first instance, before their metropolitan and his comprovincials.† Application having been made to the Pope on the subject by the French ambassador at Rome, his Holiness proposed to name the Archbishop of Paris and two other prelates as delegates for hearing the cause ; but the king decidedly objected to this method of adjudication, as an invasion of the privileges which he was bound to defend. After a tedious negotiation, it was at length arranged that the Pope should nominate a commission of nine prelates to proceed to the trial of their colleagues ; that seven should be competent to act ; that the president should have power to appoint sub-

* Clemençon, *Hist. Gen. de Port Royal*, tom. vi. p. 320.

† *Mémoires du Clergé de France*, tom. ii. p. 422, 456 et seqq.

stitutes in the room of those who might decline to act; and that the accused should not be at liberty either to challenge the judges or to appeal from their decision.

The mandements of the four bishops were at the same time denounced by a decree of the Congregation of the Index; upon which the bishops of Languedoc wrote to the king in terms of energetic remonstrance against the encroachments of the Court of Rome on the rights of the episcopate, and Louis replied by assuring them that he would always uphold their lawful jurisdiction and the liberties of the Gallican Church.

The prosecution of the bishops was suspended by the death of Alexander VII., which occurred on the 20th of May, 1667. Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi, who succeeded him under the name of Clement IX., was known to be of moderate opinions and disposed to a pacification; and measures were immediately concerted in France for taking advantage of this favourable change of circumstances. The Jansenists had lately made two proselytes of exalted rank, the Princess of Conti and the Duchess of Longueville: the former a niece of Cardinal Mazarin, married to a prince of the blood royal; the latter, once the restless intrigante of the Fronde, but now a remorseful penitent, under the spiritual guidance of Singlin. Through the intervention of these noble ladies their adopted party gained the protection of the ministers Le Tellier and De Lionne, who at that time were high in the confidence of Louis XIV. They represented the case strongly to the king, dwelling especially on the imminent risk of a schism in the Church if matters should be pressed to extremity against the four bishops. Louis allowed it to be understood that he should be glad if means could be devised for effecting an accommodation; upon which the Archbishop of Sens (De Gondrin), and Felix Vialart, Bishop of Châlons, offered their services as mediators for this purpose.

Their first step was to draw up a respectful letter to the Pope in defence of their accused brethren, which was subscribed, through their exertions, by nineteen prelates.* This

* The following extract contains its substance:—"Quod ergo ab ipsâ (fide) quidam ipsos in suis de subscriptione mandatis discessisse criminantur, alienissima ab ipsis, Beatissime Pater, et inanis suspicio est. Quid enim in illis

mandatis quod vel à Catholicæ doctrinæ normâ vel à Romanæ sedis reverentiâ tantillum deflectat? Novum et inauditum apud nos nonnulli dogma procuderunt, Ecclesiæ nempe decretis, quibus quotidiana nec revelata divini-

document assured his Holiness that the four bishops were unjustly charged with want of deference to the Holy See, since their doctrine as to the judgment of the Church on unrevealed facts was none other than that of Cardinals Baronius, Bellarmine, and Palavicini,—writers held in the highest estimation at Rome. If this was an error, it was not peculiar to the prelates in question, but was held by their colleagues, and, indeed, by the whole Church. Many French bishops had expressed the very same sentiments to their clergy,—sentiments which remained on record in their diocesan registries, although not published. The letter concluded with an eloquent appeal to Clement to signalise his accession to the Pontificate by healing the wounds of the distracted Church, an achievement which would cover his name with immortal glory.

The same prelates proceeded to address a letter to the king, setting forth that the doctrine of the Four Bishops was that which the Church had uniformly held in all ages, and that they could not be prosecuted in the manner proposed without a direct infraction of the Gallican liberties, and without degrading the bishops into mere vassals of the Pope. This production was denounced by the king to the Parliament (doubtless at the instigation of the Jesuit Annat), upon which an arrêt appeared for its suppression, and threatening penal measures against those who, by “unlawful cabals and assemblies,” caused such demonstrations. A similar course was taken with a manifesto from the four bishops themselves addressed to the whole French episcopate, in which they complained bitterly of the oppressive treatment they had met with, and entreated their

tis facta deciduntur, certam et infallibilem constare veritatem, adeoque ipsa non minus quam revelata in Scripturis et traditione dogmata fide esse tenenda. Hoc verò dogma, Beat. Pater, quod ab omnibus antiquis recentibusque theologis damnatum est, ex prædecessoris vestri constitutionibus iidem qui invexerunt stabilire nitentur. Huic malo ut occurrerent, prædicti episcopi oppositam manifesto huic errori doctrinam in mandatis suis exposuerunt, humana scilicet nec divinitus revelata facta non omnimodâ et infallibili certitudine ab Ecclesiâ definiri, ideoque in hujusmodi rebus nihil aliud

ipsam à fidelibus exigere quam ut sua decreta reverenter, ut par est, habeant. Quid in hac doctrinâ in Romanam Sedem irreligiosum? Cum non modo à summis Apostolicæ sedis veneratoribus ejusque acerrimis vindicibus, Baronio, Bellarmino, Palavicino asserta et tradita sit . . . Ita sentire si criminosum existimetur, non hoc proprium ipsorum, sed omnium nostrum, imo totius Ecclesiæ crimen fuerit. Non defuerunt nec primi nec postremi nominis Episcopi, qui idem prorsus quod illa præstiterunt, in publicis actis, sive tabulis in quibus eandem latè doctrinam explicarunt.”

brethren to unite in a firm resistance to this attack upon the privileges of their Order. The paper is of considerable length; it is replete with learning and forcible argument, and may be said to exhaust the subject of which it treats. The bishops appeal to the records of antiquity, to the canons of Antioch, Sardica, and the celebrated Councils of Africa in the time of Popes Zosimus, Cœlestine, and Boniface, in proof of the great principle that bishops are to be judged by the metropolitan and his suffragans assembled in provincial Synod. They shew that this was confirmed by the Gallican Code received by Charlemagne from Pope Adrian I.; and, further, that it is implied even by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. They cite, likewise, the Articles published by the Sorbonne in 1663, one of which condemns any infraction of the ecclesiastical laws of the realm, and, in particular, any attempt to depose bishops contrary to the regulations laid down in the canons. "We acknowledge," they say, "the pre-eminence of the Holy See, and the supreme dignity of the successor of Peter; but we also know that we are *all* successors of the Apostles; that the Pope is our superior by Divine right, but that he is not the only bishop. We know that we ourselves, equally with him, have received our authority from Jesus Christ himself; and that the Holy Ghost has appointed each one of us to govern in the quality of His vicars (as all antiquity bears witness) that portion of the Church which is confided to our care." * This circular was suppressed by the Council of State on the 4th of July, 1668; and the bishops were commanded to address themselves to the king upon all matters concerning the interests of the clergy, without putting forth public statements upon such subjects except with his previous permission.

Notwithstanding these discouraging circumstances, the negotiation for restoring peace proceeded; but it was conducted with extreme caution, and was kept a profound secret from Father Annat and the Ultramontanes, who would have strained every nerve, as on the former occasion, to ruin the scheme. For the same reason it was carefully concealed from the Archbishop of Paris; for, as a member of the Council of Conscience, he could hardly have avoided mentioning it to his Jesuit col-

* See Varet, *Relation de la Paix de Clement IX.*, tom. ii. p. 19.

leagues. The Nuncio Bargellini, Archbishop of Thebes, had lately arrived in France, furnished with ample powers on the part of the Pope; and in his presence anxious consultations were now held as to the best mode of arranging the terms of reconciliation. Besides De Gondrin and Vialart, the Bishop of Laon, afterwards so well known as Cardinal d'Estrées, rendered important service, at this critical moment, to the cause of peace.

It was no easy task to mediate between two parties, neither of whom was willing to make the very slightest concession or sacrifice. The Pope, it was evident, could not recede from his demand of an absolute and unreserved acceptance of the Formulary; the bishops, on the other hand, positively declined to subscribe it without making a clear distinction between the *droit* and the *fait*. Various plans were discussed and abandoned. At last it was proposed that the bishops, without being required to retract their mandements, should sign the Formulary afresh, as if they had taken no steps in the matter before, and should cause it to be signed by their clergy; that any explanatory remarks which they might wish to make should be made by a *procès-verbal* at their diocesan Synods, such written statements not to be published, but to be deposited in the registry of each diocese; and that they should afterwards join in a letter to the Pope, informing him of this new act of dutiful submission to his authority. This expedient was approved by the Nuncio, accepted, on his recommendation, by the Pope, and ultimately adopted.

The composition of the proposed letter to the Pope was entrusted to Arnauld and Nicole, who acquitted themselves with all their usual ability. The draft was submitted to the Ministers, and by them to the king; the Nuncio made some slight alterations, and it was then signed by himself and the Archbishop of Sens; upon which this memorable transaction was deemed complete. It remained, however, to obtain the personal adhesion of the four prelates; and here, much to the alarm of the negociators, the Bishop of Alet proved for some time intractable. Courier after courier was despatched to urge him to compliance, but in vain. At last he yielded to the importunate entreaties of the Bishop of Comminges, Antoine Arnauld, and other friends, and appended his signature on the

10th of September, 1668. The other prelates assented without difficulty.

The bishops represented, in this famous document,* that, "having learned that with regard to the manner of executing the constitution of Pope Alexander and subscribing the Formulary, many French bishops had followed a line of conduct differing from their own and more agreeable to his Holiness, they had deemed it right to imitate them in this particular, having nothing more nearly at heart than to contribute to the peace and union of the Church; that they had, therefore, assembled their diocesan Synods, and prescribed a fresh subscription, in which they themselves had joined; that they had given the same instructions to their clergy that had been given by the bishops their colleagues; that they had enforced the same deference to the constitutions of the Holy See that had been required in other dioceses; and that, as they had always been united to their episcopal brethren by an identity of doctrinal sentiment, so they were now in accordance with them in point of discipline and mode of proceeding." They concluded with an elaborate protestation of unqualified submission to the chair of St. Peter and of respect for the Holy Father personally.

In the procès-verbal made by the Bishop of Alet at his diocesan Synod, held on the 15th of September, he explained to the clergy that their subscription of the Formulary implied "a sincere, entire, and unreserved condemnation of all the false doctrine which the Popes and the Church had condemned in the Five Propositions, so as to profess no other doctrine on that head than that of the Catholic and Roman Church." Moreover, that the doctrine of St. Augustine and St. Thomas on grace "efficacious by itself" is not to be held comprised in the

* The letter runs thus in the original:—"Cum in exequendâ decessoris vestri de subscribendâ fidei Formulâ Constitutione, multi Gallicani episcopi, nobiscum licet sensibus conjunctissimi, eam disciplinæ formam amplexi sint quam Sanctitati vestræ acceptiorem fuisse intelleximus, nos, quibus nihil est antiquius quàm paci unitatque consulere, et nostram erga Sedem Apostolicam reverentiam testificari, non pin-

guit eorum institutum imitari; quamobrem congregatâ, sicut illi, Diœcesanâ Synodo, et imperatâ novâ subscriptione, nos insubscripsimus; quæ suis ipsi clericis tradiderunt, nostris tradidimus; quod in Apostolicas Constitutiones injunxerunt, injunximus; prorsusque nos ipsis, ut pridem doctrinâ, ita nunc in hâc disciplinæ formâ conjunximus."

false doctrine so condemned, according to the repeated declarations of the Popes themselves; and lastly, that with regard to the fact enunciated in the Formulary, their subscription signified only submission of respect and discipline, which consisted in not opposing the Pontifical decision, and preserving silence; since the Church, being not infallible as to facts of this description, did not pretend, by her own sole authority, to compel her children to believe them. The other bishops expressed themselves in almost the same terms.*

Clement IX., by a brief addressed to the king on the 8th of October, declared himself satisfied with the conduct of the four prelates, on the understanding that they had submitted "by a sincere acceptance of the Formulary." Thereupon an arrêt of the Council of State (October 23, 1668), after reciting such submission, announced that, since the Pope was satisfied, the king was satisfied also; ordered that the Papal constitutions should continue to be inviolably observed throughout the kingdom; and that all proceedings in contravention of them should be considered null and void. The king, moreover, forbade all persons henceforth to attack or provoke one another by using the opprobrious terms of "heretic," "Jansenist," "semi-Pelagian," or other party appellations; nor was anything to be published concerning the contested questions, or injurious to the reputation of those who had taken part in them, under pain of exemplary punishment.

These events were hailed with the utmost satisfaction and joy by all classes except those whose interest lay in preventing the restoration of peace.† Antoine Arnauld emerged forthwith from his retirement, was presented to the Nuncio, and afterwards, by his nephew Pomponne, to the king at St. Germain, where he met with a gracious reception. De Sacy, who had been immured for upwards of two years in the Bastille, was

* Gerberon, *Hist. Gen. du Jansenisme*, tom. iii. p. 177 *et seqq.*

† We learn from D. Clemençon (*Hist. Gén. de P. R.*, tom. vi. p. 361) that F. Annat, as soon as the result of the negotiation was announced, hastened to the king, and strove to persuade him that any such arrangement must needs be deeply prejudicial both to religion

and the State. "As to the welfare of religion," replied Louis somewhat coldly, "that is the Pope's affair; if he is satisfied, you and I are bound to be so likewise. And with regard to the interests of the State, I recommend you not to trouble yourself much on that score; I will take care that whatever is necessary shall be done."

set at liberty, introduced at Court, and became, together with Arnauld, an object of general and enthusiastic admiration. The famous preacher Desmares reappeared in the pulpit of St. Roch. The interdict was removed from Port Royal, upon a petition from the sisters to the Archbishop, which contained an act of submission in terms dictated by the prelate himself. The Solitaires, having no further cause for concealment, repaired to their former haunts in the valley of Chevreuse; and Madame de Longueville, who was now saluted by the Jansenists as the "mother of the Church," established herself in a mansion which she had built close to the monastery. The King nominated as abbess of Port Royal a nun called Dorothée Perdreau, one of the few who had signed the Formulary when it was resisted by the rest of the community in 1664.

Whether Clement IX. really believed that the Four Bishops had accepted the Formulary without restriction or distinction, is a question which has been warmly debated. It appears that he was not informed beforehand of the arrangement by which they were to make a written explanation of their views in the diocesan Synods; indeed, if this condition had *not* been concealed from him, it is difficult to understand how the negotiation could have proved successful. On the other hand, the bishops stated in their letter that they had adopted the same line of action with their nineteen brethren who had addressed the Pope in their favour; and it was perfectly well known that these prelates recognised a distinction between the *fait* and the *droit*, though no mention of that circumstance had been made in their public mandements. There can be no doubt that Clement regarded the whole affair more or less in the light of a compromise; and that, accordingly, he thought it right to accept the act of submission in the sense in which he had demanded it, without inquiring into further details. No sooner, however, was the event made public, than it began to be rumoured that the bishops had acted insincerely; that they had pretended to give satisfaction to the Nuncio and the Pope by unqualified submission, whereas they had clandestinely renewed that very distinction between the *droit* and the *fait* which had been so often and so positively condemned.* It

* *Ellics-Dupin, II. E. du XVII. siècle, tom. i. liv. iii.*

was not long before these complaints reached the ears of the Pope; and he at once instructed the Nuncio to investigate the matter thoroughly, and to exact from the bishops a certificate in due form that they had subscribed the Formulary, and caused it to be signed, *in all sincerity*, in conformity with the constitutions of his predecessors.* To this they consented readily, nor was there anything to prevent their doing so. The very means by which the arrangement had been arrived at was the substitution of the phrase “a *sincere* acceptance” for that of “an acceptance *pure and simple*.” Doubtless they had signed in sincerity, for the explanation appended to their act of subscription had been made for the sole purpose of enabling them to sign with a safe conscience; but it is no less certain that they retracted nothing whatever of their previously expressed opinions; and that, whether with or without the Pope’s connivance, they availed themselves of a saving clause which effectually sheltered their long-cherished conviction with regard to the “fact of Jansenius.”

By way of a further guarantee to his Holiness, the Bishop of Châlons executed a formal document, declaring that the four bishops and their clergy had acted with perfect good faith; had condemned, without exception or reserve, all the errors which the Church had censured in the five Propositions; and with regard to the *fact*, had rendered to the Holy See all due deference and submission, according to the doctrine on that point taught by the greatest theologians of all ages.† This was likewise attested by the signature of Antoine Arnauld, as representative of the Port Royalist divines.

Having received this authentic declaration, Clement conceived that no further ground existed for questioning the uprightness of the bishops in the transaction; he, therefore, addressed a brief to them, dated January 19th, 1669, which is regarded as the official ratification of the “Peace of Clement IX.” His Holiness alluded to certain current reports connected with their act of submission, which had made it necessary to proceed with caution in the affair; and observed

* *Œuvres d'Arnauld*, tom. xxv. p. 125. | *Relation de ce qui s'est passé*, &c. D'Avrigny, *Mém. Chronol.*, tom. iii. p. 78.

† B. Racine, *Hist. Eccles.* Varet,

that he could never have permitted any sort of restriction or exception in the signature, being strongly attached to the constitutions of his predecessors. But, after the renewed testimonies which had reached him of their perfect sincerity and obedience, he could no longer withhold the assurance of his paternal satisfaction; he therefore transmitted to them, with much affection, the apostolical benediction.*

In order to commemorate the happy termination of this lengthened conflict, a medal was struck at the mint, bearing on one side the head of Louis XIV., and on the other a book lying open on an altar, across which were the keys of St. Peter and the royal sceptre saltierwise; above was the holy Dove surrounded by rays, with the legend "Gratia et pax à Deo;" at the foot of the altar ran the motto, "Ob restitutam Ecclesie concordiam."

It is hardly to be wondered at, but not the less to be regretted, that the Jansenists betrayed, in their hour of triumph, feelings of boastful exultation which might have been far more wisely suppressed. With singular bad taste they proclaimed in the most public manner that the conduct of Clement IX. was inconsistent with, and condemnatory of, that of his predecessors; that he had sanctioned a mode of subscription which they had denounced as fraudulent and hypocritical; and that the same persons who for years past had been branded as heretics for refusing to believe that the five Propositions were taught by Jansenius, were now acknowledged by the Pope, the bishops, and the King of France to be orthodox Catholics, although they maintained precisely the same sentiments as before, and had never made any statements or admissions which they had not been perfectly ready to make at any period of the controversy. Such was the main purport of a 'History of the Pacification of the Church,' put forth under the auspices of the party by an ecclesiastic named Varet, vicar-general to the Archbishop of Sens; of another work, with the same title, by Father Quesnel, of the Oratory; and of the 'Phantôme du Jansénisme,' a treatise from the pen of Arnauld himself.

Clement IX. survived scarcely a year the celebrated act

* D'Argentré, *Collect. Judic.*, tom. iii. p. 337.

of amnesty which bears his name. He died December 9th, 1669, and was succeeded, after a few months, by Cardinal Altieri, who took the title of Clement X. The following year witnessed a change in the government of the diocese of Paris: Archbishop Péréfixe expired on the 31st of December, 1670, and was replaced by François de Harlai, Archbishop of Rouen, a man of considerable learning and administrative talent, but of harsh temperament and indifferent morals.

END OF VOL. I.

